arXiv:1108.4637v1 [math.FA] 23 Aug 2011

OPERATOR AND COMMUTATOR MODULI OF CONTINUITY FOR NORMAL OPERATORS

A.B. ALEKSANDROV AND V.V. PELLER

Abstract. We study in this paper properties of functions of perturbed normal operators and develop earlier results obtained in [APPS2]. We study operator Lipschitz and commutator Lipschitz functions on closed subsets of the plane. For such functions we introduce the notions of the operator modulus of continuity and of various commutator moduli of continuity. Our estimates lead to estimates of the norms of quasicommutators $f(N_1)R-Rf(N_2)$ in terms of $\|N_1R-RN_2\|$, where N_1 and N_2 are normal operator and R is a bounded linear operator. In particular, we show that if $0<\alpha<1$ and f is a Hölder function of order α, then for normal operators N_1 and N_2,

$$\|f(N_1)R-Rf(N_2)\|\le\operatorname{const}(1-\alpha)^{-2}\|f\|_{\Lambda_\alpha}\|N_1R-RN_2\|^{\alpha}\|R\|^{1-\alpha}.$$

In the last section we obtain lower estimates for constants in operator Hölder estimates.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Schur multipliers and double operator integrals 4
3. Operator Lipschitz and commutator Lipschitz functions 8
4. Absolutely convergent Fourier integrals and estimates of commutator Lipschitz norms 14
5. Operator and commutator moduli of continuity 18
6. Estimates of commutator moduli of continuity 27
7. Constants in operator Hölder inequalities 31
References 32

1. **Introduction**

In this paper we continue the study of properties of functions of normal operators under perturbation. This study was undertaken in [APPS2] (see also [APPS1]). Let us summarize briefly some results obtained in [APPS2].

It was shown in [APPS2] that if f is a function on the plane that belongs to the (homogeneous) Besov space $B_{\infty1}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then it is *operator Lipschitz*, i.e.,

$$\|f(N_1)-f(N_2)\|\le\operatorname{const}\|N_1-N_2\|$$

for arbitrary normal (not necessarily bounded) operators N_1 and N_2 such that $N_1 - N_2$ is bounded. We refer the reader to [Pee] for definitions and basic properties of Besov spaces.

Note that a *Lipschitz function* on the plane (i.e., a function f such that

$$|f(\zeta_1) - f(\zeta_2)| \le \text{const}\,|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|, \quad \zeta_1,\,\zeta_2 \in \mathbb{C})$$

does not have to be operator Lipschitz. This is not true even for functions defined on the real line $\mathbb{R}$, i.e., there are Lipschitz functions f on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\sup \frac{\|f(A) - f(B)\|}{\|A - B\|} = \infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over bounded self-adjoint operators A and B. The first example of such functions was constructed in [F]. Later it was shown in [Mc] and [K] that the function $x \mapsto |x|$ on $\mathbb{R}$ is not operator Lipschitz. Note also that in [Pe2] a necessary condition was found: if a function f on $\mathbb{R}$ is operator Lipschitz, then f belongs locally to the Besov class $B^1_{1,1}(\mathbb{R})$.

It was also shown in [APPS2] that if f belongs to the *Hölder class* $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, i.e.,

$$|f(\zeta_1) - f(\zeta_2)| \le \text{const}\,|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|^\alpha, \quad \zeta_1,\,\zeta_2 \in \mathbb{C},$$

then f is *operator Hölder of order* α, i.e.,

$$\|f(N_1) - f(N_2)\| \le c_\alpha \|f\|_{\Lambda_\alpha} \|N_1 - N_2\|^\alpha \tag{1.1}$$

for arbitrary (not necessarily bounded) normal operators N_1 and N_2 such that $N_1 - N_2$ is bounded. Moreover, it is shown in [APPS2] that $c_\alpha \le \text{const}(1-\alpha)^{-1}$. Here

$$\|f\|_{\Lambda_\alpha} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\zeta_1 \ne \zeta_2} \frac{|f(\zeta_1) - f(\zeta_2)|}{|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|^\alpha}.$$

More general results were also obtained in [APPS2] in the case of arbitrary moduli of continuity. Recall that a continuous nondecreasing function $\omega : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is called a *modulus of continuity* if

$$\omega(x + y) \le \omega(x) + \omega(y), \quad x,\, y \in [0,\infty).$$

It was shown in [APPS2] that if ω is a modulus of continuity and $f \in \Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{R}^2)$, i.e.,

$$|f(\zeta_1) - f(\zeta_2)| \le \text{const}\,\omega\big(|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|\big), \quad \zeta_1,\,\zeta_2 \in \mathbb{C},$$

then

$$\|f(N_1) - f(N_2)\| \le C\|f\|_{\Lambda_\omega}\,\omega_*\big(\|N_1 - N_2\|\big),$$

where C is a numerical constant and

$$\omega_*(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta \int_\delta^\infty \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2}\,dt = \int_1^\infty \frac{\omega(t\delta)}{t^2}\,dt, \quad \delta > 0. \tag{1.2}$$

Here

$$\|f\|_{\Lambda_\omega} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\zeta_1 \ne \zeta_2} \frac{|f(\zeta_1) - f(\zeta_2)|}{\omega(|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|)}.$$

We would like to also mention here that in [APPS2] estimates for Schatten–von Neumann norms norms of $f(N_1) - f(N_2)$ as well as other ideal norms are also obtained.

Note that similar results were obtained earlier for self-adjoint operators (as well as for unitary operators, contractions, and dissipative operators) in [Pe2], [Pe4], [Pe5], [AP1], [AP2], [AP3], [AP4], [Pe3], [AP5].

Analogous estimates were obtained in [APPS2] for commutators and quasicommutators. Namely, it was shown in [APPS2] that if $f \in B^1_{\infty 1}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then

$$\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le \operatorname{const} \|f\|_{B^1_{\infty 1}} \max\big\{\|N_1R - RN_2\|, \|N_1^*R - RN_2^*\|\big\} \tag{1.3}$$

for an arbitrary bounded operator R and arbitrary normal operators N_1 and N_2 such that the operators $N_1R - RN_2$ and $N_1^*R - RN_2^*$ are bounded.

Next, the following analog of (1.1) was proved in [APPS2]:

$$\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le c_\alpha \|f\|_{\Lambda_\alpha} \max\big\{\|N_1R - RN_2\|, \|N_1^*R - RN_2^*\|\big\}^\alpha \|R\|^{1-\alpha}, \tag{1.4}$$

whenever $f \in \Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, R is a bounded operator, and N_1 and N_2 are normal operators such that the operators $N_1R - RN_2$ and $N_1^*R - RN_2^*$ are bounded. Here $c_\alpha \le \operatorname{const}(1-\alpha)^{-1}$.

Finally, it was shown in [APPS2] that under the same hypotheses on R, N_1 and N_2, the following inequality holds for an arbitrary modulus of continuity ω and an arbitrary function f in $\Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{R}^2)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \\ &\qquad \le \operatorname{const} \|f\|_{\Lambda_\omega} \|R\| \, \omega_*\left(\frac{\max\big\{\|N_1R - RN_2\|, \|N_1^*R - RN_2^*\|\big\}}{\|R\|}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

In this paper we consider the problem of whether we can estimate the quasicommutator norms $\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\|$ in terms of $\|N_1R - RN_2\|$ rather than in terms of $\max\big\{\|N_1R - RN_2\|, \|N_1^*R - RN_2^*\|\big\}$.

Let us first mention that in inequality (1.3) it is impossible to replace $\max\big\{\|N_1R - RN_2\|, \|N_1^*R - RN_2^*\|\big\}$ with $\|N_1R - RN_2\|$. Indeed, it can be deduced from results of [JW] that if

$$\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le \operatorname{const} \|N_1R - RN_2\| \tag{1.6}$$

for arbitrary bounded N_1 and N_2 with spectra contained in a given closed set $\mathfrak{F}$, then f must have complex derivative at each nonisolated point of $\mathfrak{F}$. In particular, if $\mathfrak{F} = \mathbb{C}$ and f satisfies (1.6), then $f(z) = az + b$ for some a, $b \in \mathbb{C}$.

Surprisingly, it turns out that inequality (1.4) still holds if we replace $\max\big\{\|N_1R - RN_2\|, \|N_1^*R - RN_2^*\|\big\}$ with $\|N_1R - RN_2\|$. However, the constant c_α jumps. Namely, we show in § 6 of this paper that

$$\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le c_\alpha \|f\|_{\Lambda_\alpha} \|N_1R - RN_2\|^\alpha \|R\|^{1-\alpha} \tag{1.7}$$

with $c_\alpha \le \operatorname{const}(1-\alpha)^{-2}$. We do not know whether inequality (1.7) holds with $c_\alpha \le \operatorname{const}(1-\alpha)^{-1}$.

We also obtain in § 6 the following modification of inequality (1.5):

$$\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le \operatorname{const} \|f\|_{\Lambda_\omega} \|R\| \, \omega_{**}\left(\frac{\|N_1R - RN_2\|}{\|R\|}\right), \tag{1.8}$$

where $\omega_{**} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\omega_*)_*$. Again, we do not know whether we can replace in (1.8) ω_{**} with ω_*.

In § 7 we study the problem of whether our estimate of the constant c_α in inequality (1.1) is sharp. We show that $c_\alpha \ge C(1-\alpha)^{-1/2}$ for a positive number C.

We introduce in § 5 various commutator moduli of continuity and study their properties. We study in § 3 some properties of operator Lipschitz and commutator Lipschitz functions.

In § 4 we give some auxiliary results: norm estimates in the space of functions with absolutely convergent Fourier integrals and estimates of commutator Lipschitz norms.

Finally, in § 2 we give an introduction into Schur multipliers and double operator integrals.

2. **Schur multipliers and double operator integrals**

We define in this section notion of Schur multipliers associated with two spectral measures. However, we start the section with the definition of Schur multipliers associated with two scalar measures. This corresponds to the case of spectral measures of multiplicity 1. We discuss properties of Schur multipliers and define double operator integrals.

Let $(\mathcal{X},\mu)$ and $(\mathcal{Y},\nu)$ be σ-finite measure spaces. Let $k \in L^2(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y},\mu\otimes\nu)$. Then k induces the integral operator $\mathcal{I}_k = \mathcal{I}_k^{\mu,\nu}$ from $L^2(\nu) = L^2(\mathcal{Y},\nu)$ to $L^2(\mu) = L^2(\mathcal{X},\mu)$ defined by

$$(\mathcal{I}_k f)(x) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} k(x,y)f(y)\,d\nu(y), \qquad f \in L^2(\mathcal{Y},\nu).$$

Denote by $\|k\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \|k\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}$ the operator norm of $\mathcal{I}_k$. Let Φ be a $\mu\otimes\nu$-measurable function defined almost everywhere on $\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}$. We say that Φ is a *Schur multiplier with respect to* μ *and* ν if

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\big\{\|\Phi k\|_{\mathcal{B}}:\ k\,,\Phi k \in L^2(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y},\mu\otimes\nu),\ \|k\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le 1\big\} < \infty.$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ the space of Schur multipliers with respect to μ and ν. It can be shown easily that $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}} \subset L^\infty(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y},\mu\otimes\nu)$ and

$$\|\Phi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y},\mu\otimes\nu)} \le \|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}. \tag{2.1}$$

Thus if $\Phi \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$, then

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}} = \sup\big\{\|\Phi k\|_{\mathcal{B}}:\ k \in L^2(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y},\mu\otimes\nu),\ \|k\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le 1\big\}.$$

Note that $\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ is a Banach algebra:

$$\|\Phi_1\Phi_2\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}} \le \|\Phi_1\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}\|\Phi_2\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}.$$

It is easy to see that $\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}} = \|\Phi_\flat\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\nu,\mu}_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{X}}}$ for $\Phi_\flat(y,x) = \Phi(x,y)$.

Note that if $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are at most countable sets, and μ and ν are the counting measures on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$, the above definition coincides with the definition of Schur multipliers on the space of matrices: a matrix $A = \{a_{jk}\}$ is called a Schur multiplier on the space of bounded matrices if

$$A \star B \quad \text{is a matrix of a bounded operator, whenever} \quad B \quad \text{is.}$$

Here we use the notation

$$A \star B = \{a_{jk}b_{jk}\} \tag{2.2}$$

for the Schur–Hadamard product of the matrices $A = \{a_{jk}\}$ and $B = \{b_{jk}\}$

Clearly, the norm of A in the space of Schur multipliers is the norm of the transformer

$$B \mapsto A \star B.$$

We need the following known result:

Lemma 2.1. *Let* $\{G_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence of disjoint* μ*-measurable subsets of* $\mathcal{X}$ *and let* $\{H_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence of disjoint* ν*-measurable subsets of* $\mathcal{Y}$*. Put* $Z \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} (G_n \times H_n)$*. Then* $\|\chi_Z\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}^{\mu,\nu}} \le 1$.

Proof. Let $k \in L^2(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}, \mu \otimes \nu)$, $f \in L^2(\mathcal{Y}, \nu)$ and $g \in L^2(\mathcal{X}, \mu)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\mathcal{I}_{\chi_Z k} f, g)| &= \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \big(\mathcal{I}_k(\chi_{H_n} f), \chi_{G_n} g\big) \right| \\
&\le \|k\|_{\mathcal{B}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|\chi_{H_n} f\|_{L^2(\nu)} \|\chi_{G_n} f\|_{L^2(\mu)} \\
&\le \|k\|_{\mathcal{B}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|\chi_{H_n} f\|^2_{L^2(\nu)} \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \|\chi_{G_n} g\|^2_{L^2(\mu)} \right)^{1/2} \\
&\le \|k\|_{\mathcal{B}} \|f\|_{L^2(\nu)} \|g\|_{L^2(\mu)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\|\chi_Z k\|_{\mathcal{B}} \le \|k\|_{\mathcal{B}}$, and so $\|\chi_Z\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}^{\mu,\nu}} \le 1$. ■

Clearly, taking (2.1) into account, we find that

$$\|\chi_Z\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}^{\mu,\nu}} = 1, \tag{2.3}$$

whenever $(\mu \otimes \nu)(Z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(G_n)\nu(H_n) > 0$.

To state a description of the space of Schur multipliers we define the *integral projective tensor product* $L^\infty(\mu)\hat{\otimes}_{\rm i} L^\infty(\nu)$ of $L^\infty(\mu)$ and $L^\infty(\nu)$. We say that $\Phi \in L^\infty(\mu)\hat{\otimes}_{\rm i} L^\infty(\nu)$ if Φ admits a representation

$$\Phi(x, y) = \int_\Omega \varphi(x, w)\psi(y, w)\, d\lambda(w), \tag{2.4}$$

where (Ω, λ) is a σ-finite measure space, φ is a measurable function on $\mathscr{X} \times \Omega$, ψ is a measurable function on $\mathscr{Y} \times \Omega$, and

$$\int_\Omega \|\varphi(\cdot, w)\|_{L^\infty(\mu)} \|\psi(\cdot, w)\|_{L^\infty(\nu)}\, d\lambda(w) < \infty.$$

The space of Schur multipliers admits the following description:

Theorem on Schur multipliers. *Let* $(\mathcal{X},\mu)$ *and* $(\mathcal{Y},\nu)$ *be* σ*-finite measure spaces and let* Φ *be a measurable function on* $\mathscr{X}\times\mathscr{Y}$*. The following are equivalent:*
(i) $\Phi\in\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$;
(ii) $\Phi\in L^\infty(\mu)\hat{\otimes}_{\rm i}L^\infty(\nu)$;
(iii) *there exist a* σ*-finite measure space* (Ω,λ)*, measurable functions* φ *on* $\mathscr{X}\times\Omega$ *and* ψ *on* $\mathscr{Y}\times\Omega$ *such that* (2.4) *holds and*

$$\left\|\left(\int_\Omega|\varphi(\cdot,w)|^2\,d\lambda(w)\right)^{1/2}\right\|_{L^\infty(E)}\left\|\left(\int_\Omega|\psi(\cdot,w)|^2\,d\lambda(w)\right)^{1/2}\right\|_{L^\infty(F)}<\infty.$$

We refer the reader to [Pe2] for more detailed information and references.

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be closed subsets of $\mathbb{C}$. We denote by $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ the space of Borel Schur multipliers on $\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}$, i.e., the space of Borel functions Φ defined everywhere on $\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}$ such that

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\sup\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}<\infty,$$

where the supremum is taken over all Borel measures μ and ν on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$. In the case $\mathcal{X}=\mathcal{Y}$, we use the notation

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X}}\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X}}.$$

It can be shown easily that

$$\sup_{(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}}|\Phi(x,y)|\le\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}.$$

It is also easy to verify that if $\Phi_n\in\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$, Φ is a bounded Borel function on $\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}$, and $\Phi_n(x,y)\to\Phi(x,y)$ for all $(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}$, then

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}\le\liminf_{n\to\infty}\|\Phi_n\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}.$$

In particular, $\Phi\in\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$ if $\liminf\limits_{n\to\infty}\|\Phi_n\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}<\infty$.

We need the following version of Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.2. *Let* μ *and* ν *be Borel measures on closed subsets* $\mathcal{X}$ *and* $\mathcal{Y}$ *of* $\mathbb{C}$*. Put*

$$\Delta\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\{(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y}\ :x=y\}.$$

Then $\|\chi_\Delta\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}\le1$ *and hence,* $\|\chi_\Delta\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}\le1$.

Proof. Put $\mathcal{X}_0\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\{x\in\mathcal{X}:\mu(\{x\})>0\}$, $\mathcal{Y}_0\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\{y\in\mathcal{Y}:\nu(\{y\})>0\}$ and $\Delta_0\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\{(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}_0\times\mathcal{Y}_0:x=y\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{X}_0$ and $\mathcal{Y}_0$ are at most countable. It is easy to see that $(\mu\otimes\nu)(\Delta\setminus\Delta_0)=0$. Hence, $\|\chi_\Delta\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}=\|\chi_{\Delta_0}\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}$. It remains to observe that $\|\chi_{\Delta_0}\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}\le1$ by Lemma 2.1. ■

Corollary 2.3. *Under the hypotheses of the lemma, the following inequality holds:*

$$\|\chi_{(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})\setminus\Delta}\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}\le2\quad\textit{and}\quad\|\chi_{(\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{Y})\setminus\Delta}\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}}\le2.$$

The following result is also well known.

Let $f \in C(\mathbb{C})$. *Put* $\Phi(z,w) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} f(z-w)$. *Then* $\Phi \in \mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{C}}$ *if and only if there exists a complex measure* μ *on* $\mathbb{C}$ *such that*

$$f(z) = \int_{\mathbb{C}} e^{-\mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{Re}(z\overline{\zeta})}\,d\mu(\zeta) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{C}}} = |\mu|(\mathbb{C}). \tag{2.5}$$

A similar statement holds for an arbitrary locally compact abelian group. The case of the group $\mathbb{Z}$ is considered, e.g., in [Be].

Let us proceed now to double operator integrals. The theory of double operator integrals was developed by Birman and Solomyak in [BS1], [BS2], and [BS3], see also their survey [BS4].

Let $(\mathscr{X}, E_1)$ and $(\mathscr{Y}, E_2)$ be spaces with spectral measures E_1 and E_2 on a separable Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. The approach of Birman and Solomyak is to define first double operator integrals

$$\int\limits_{\mathscr{X}}\int\limits_{\mathscr{Y}} \Phi(x,y)\,dE_1(x)T\,dE_2(y), \tag{2.6}$$

for bounded measurable functions Φ and operators T of Hilbert Schmidt class $\boldsymbol{S}_2$.

We define here double operator integrals for arbitrary bounded operators T and refer the reader to [BS1], [BS3], and [Pe2].

Definition. Let μ and ν be σ-finite measures on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ such that E_1 and μ are mutually absolutely continuous, and E_2 and ν are mutually absolutely continuous. We say that a measurable function Φ on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ is *a Schur multiplier with respect to* E_1 *and* E_2 if $\Phi \in \mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}$. We denote the space of such Schur multipliers by $\mathfrak{M}(E_2, E_1)$.

It is well known that the definition does not depend on the choice of measures μ and ν.

Let us now define double operator integrals (2.6) for bounded operators T. Suppose that $\Phi \in \mathfrak{M}(E_2, E_1)$ and Φ admits a representation (2.4) with

$$\int_{\Omega} \|\varphi(\cdot, w)\|_{L^\infty(E_1)} \|\psi(\cdot, w)\|_{L^\infty(E_2)}\,d\lambda(w) < \infty.$$

We put

$$\int\limits_{\mathscr{X}}\int\limits_{\mathscr{Y}} \Phi(x,y)\,dE_1(x)T\,dE_2(y) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \int\limits_{\Omega} \left(\int\limits_{\mathscr{X}} \varphi(x,w)\,dE_1(x) \right) T \left(\int\limits_{\mathscr{Y}} \psi(y,w)\,dE_2(y) \right) d\lambda(w).$$

It can be shown that the definition does not depend on the choice of a representation (2.4).

It is also well known that for $\Phi \in \mathfrak{M}(E_2, E_1)$,

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\mu,\nu}_{\mathcal{X},\mathcal{Y}}} = \|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}(E_2,E_1)},$$

where

$$\|\Phi\|_{\mathfrak{M}(E_2,E_1)} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sup_{\|T\|\le 1}\left\|\int\limits_{\mathscr{X}}\int\limits_{\mathscr{Y}}\Phi(x,y)\,dE_1(x)T\,dE_2(y)\right\|$$

and μ and ν are as in the above definition.

Birman and Solomyak proved that if R is a bounded linear operator, A and B are (not necessarily bounded) self-adjoint operators such that $AR-RB$ is bounded and if f is a continuously differentiable function on $\mathbb{R}$ such that the divided difference $\mathfrak{D}f$ defined by

$$(\mathfrak{D}f)(x,y)=\frac{f(x)-f(y)}{x-y}$$

is a Schur multiplier with respect to the spectral measures of A and B, then

$$f(A)R-Rf(B)=\iint_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{D}f)(x,y)\,dE_A(x)(AR-RB)\,dE_B(y) \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\|f(A)R-Rf(B)\|\le\|f\|_{\mathfrak{M}(E_A,E_B)}\|AR-RB\|,$$

(see [BS3]).

Let us proceed now the case of normal operators. Suppose that N_1 and N_2 are normal operators, R is a bounded operator such that the operator N_1R-RN_2 is bounded, f is a continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$, and the function $\mathfrak{D}_0f$ is defined by

$$(\mathfrak{D}_0f)(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\begin{cases}\frac{f(\zeta_1)-f(\zeta_2)}{\zeta_1-\zeta_2}, & \zeta_1\ne\zeta_2,\\ 0, & \zeta_1=\zeta_2.\end{cases}$$

As in the case of self-adjoint operators, it can be shown that

$$f(N_1)R-Rf(N_2)=\iint\limits_{\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C}}(\mathfrak{D}_0f)(\zeta_1,\zeta_2)\,dE_{N_1}(\zeta_1)(N_1R-RN_2)\,dE_{N_2}(\zeta_2), \tag{2.8}$$

whenever $\mathfrak{D}_0f\in\mathfrak{M}(E_{N_1},E_{N_2})$. Moreover,

$$\|f(N_1)R-Rf(N_2)\|\le\|\mathfrak{D}_0f\|_{\mathfrak{M}(E_{N_1},E_{N_2})}.$$

However, the class of functions f, for which formula (2.8) can be used is not as ample in general as in the case of formula (2.7). Indeed, it follows from results of [JW] that if $N_1=N_2$ and the spectrum $\sigma(N_1)$ of N_1 has a nonisolated point, then f must have complex derivative at that point. In particular, $\mathfrak{D}_0f\in\mathfrak{M}(E_{N_1},E_{N_2})$ for all such normal operators N_1 and N_2 if and only if f is a linear function.

3. **Operator Lipschitz and commutator Lipschitz functions**

In this section we study properties of operator Lipschitz functions. We also introduce the class of commutator Lipschitz functions.

We deal in this section with bounded normal operators. We show later that almost all the results remain valid for unbounded normal operators, see § 5.

Let **SA** denote the set of bounded self-adjoint operators, **U** denote the set of unitary operators, and let **P** denote the set of orthogonal projections. For a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$, we denote by $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ the set of bounded normal operators N with spectrum $\sigma(N)$ contained in $\mathfrak{F}$; $\mathbf{N} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{N}(\mathbb{C})$. Finally, we put $\mathbf{USA} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{U} \cap \mathbf{SA}$.

The following theorem is a generalization of Theorem 10.1 in [AP2].

Theorem 3.1. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) $\|f(N_1) - f(N_2)\| \le \|N_1 - N_2\|$ *for all* $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$*;*

(ii) $\|f(N)U - Uf(N)\| \le \|NU - UN\|$ *for all* $N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ *and* $U \in \mathbf{U}$*;*

(iii) $\|f(N)A - Af(N)\| \le \|NA - AN\|$ *for all* $N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ *and* $A \in \mathbf{SA}$*;*

(iv) $\|f(N)Q - Qf(N)\| \le \|NQ - QN\|$ *for all* $N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ *and* $Q \in \mathbf{USA}$*;*

(v) $\|f(N)P - Pf(N)\| \le \|NP - PN\|$ *for all* $N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ *and* $P \in \mathbf{P}$*;*

(vi) $\|f(N)R - Rf(N)\| \le \max\big\{\|NR - RN\|, \|N^*R - RN^*\|\big\}$ *for all* $N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ *and all bounded operators* R*;*

(vii) $\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le \max\big\{\|N_1R - RN_2\|, \|N_1^*R - RN_2^*\|\big\}$ *for all* $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ *and all bounded operators* R*.*

Proof. The implications (vii)⇒(i) and (iii)⇒(iv) are trivial. Note that $Q \in \mathbf{USA}$ if and only if $Q = 2P - I$ for an orthogonal projection P. Hence, statements (iv) and (v) are equivalent.

Thus it suffices to verify the implications (i)⇒(ii)⇒(iii)⇒(vi)⇒(vii) and (iv)⇒(i).

To prove the implication (i)⇒(ii), it suffices to put $N_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N$ and $N_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} UNU^*$. Let us show that (ii)⇒(iii). Substituting $U = \exp(\mathrm{i}tA)$ in (ii), we obtain

$$\big\|f(N) - \exp(\mathrm{i}tA)f(N)\exp(-\mathrm{i}tA)\big\| \le \big\|N - \exp(\mathrm{i}tA)N\exp(-\mathrm{i}tA)\big\| \quad \text{for every} \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

It remains to observe that

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\|f(N) - \exp(\mathrm{i}tA)f(N)\exp(-\mathrm{i}tA)\|}{|t|} = \|f(N)A - Af(N)\|$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to 0} \frac{\|N - \exp(\mathrm{i}tA)N\exp(-\mathrm{i}tA)\|}{|t|} = \|NA - AN\|.$$

Let us prove now that (iii)⇒(vi). We consider the normal operator $\mathscr{N}$ and the bounded self-adjoint operator $\mathscr{A}$ defined as follows

$$\mathscr{N} = \begin{pmatrix} N & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & N \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathscr{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & R \\ R^* & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that $\sigma(\mathscr{N}) = \sigma(N)$,

$$f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & f(N)R \\ f(N)R^* & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathscr{A}f(\mathscr{N}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & Rf(N) \\ R^*f(N) & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly,

$$\|f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{A} - \mathscr{A}f(\mathscr{N})\| = \max\big\{\|f(N)R - Rf(N)\|,\ \|f(N)R^* - R^*f(N)\|\big\}$$

and

$$\|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{A}-\mathscr{A}\mathscr{N}\|=\max\big\{\|NR-RN\|,\ \|NR^*-R^*N\|\big\}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(N)R-Rf(N)\|\le\|f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{A}-\mathscr{A}f(\mathscr{N})\|&\le\|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{A}-\mathscr{A}\mathscr{N}\|\\&=\max\big\{\|NR-RN\|,\ \|NR^*-R^*N\|\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Now let us show that (vi)⇒(vii). Put

$$\mathscr{N}\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\begin{pmatrix}N_1&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&N_2\end{pmatrix}\quad\text{and}\quad\mathscr{R}\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}&R\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\sigma(\mathscr{N})=\sigma(N_1)\cup\sigma(N_2)$,

$$f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{R}=\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}&f(N_1)R\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix},\quad\text{and}\quad\mathscr{R}f(\mathscr{N})=\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}&Rf(N_2)\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(N_1)R-Rf(N_2)\|&=\|f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{R}-\mathscr{R}f(\mathscr{N})\|\\&\le\max\big\{\|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{R}-\mathscr{R}\mathscr{N}\|,\ \|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{R}^*-\mathscr{R}^*\mathscr{N}\|\big\}\\&=\max\big\{\|NR-RN\|,\ \|NR^*-R^*N\|\big\}.\end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, it remains to show that (iv)⇒(i). Let $N_1,N_2\in\mathbf{N}(E)$. Put

$$\mathscr{N}=\begin{pmatrix}N_1&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&N_2\end{pmatrix}\quad\text{and}\quad\mathscr{Q}=\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}&I\\ I&\mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\mathscr{N}\in\mathbf{N}(E)$,

$$f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{Q}=\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}&f(N_1)\\ f(N_2)&\mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix},\quad\text{and}\quad\mathscr{Q}f(\mathscr{N})=\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0}&f(N_2)\\ f(N_1)&\mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix},$$

and the inequality $\|f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{Q}-\mathscr{Q}f(\mathscr{N})\|\le\|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{Q}-\mathscr{Q}\mathscr{N}\|$ implies the inequality $\|f(N_1)-f(N_2)\|\le\|N_1-N_2\|$. ■

The reasoning in the proof of (vi)⇒(vii) allows us to obtain the following statement:

Theorem 3.2. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) $\|f(N)R-Rf(N)\|\le\|NR-RN\|$ *for all* $N\in\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ *and all bounded operators* R*;*

(ii) $\|f(N_1)R-Rf(N_2)\|\le\|N_1R-RN_2\|$ *for all* $N_1,N_2\in\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ *and all bounded operators* R.

Denote by $\mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})$ the set of operator Lipschitz functions on $\mathfrak{F}$, i.e., the set of $f\in C(\mathfrak{F})$ such that

$$\|f(N_1)-f(N_2)\|\le\mathrm{const}\,\|N_1-N_2\|\quad\text{for all}\quad N_1,\ N_2\in\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}).\tag{3.1}$$

We use the notation $\|f\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})}$ for the best constant on the right-hand side of (3.1). It is easy to see that $\|f\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})} \le 1$ if and only if f satisfies the equivalent statements of Theorem 3.1.

Denote by $\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})$ the set of commutator Lipschitz functions on $\mathfrak{F}$, i.e., the set of $f \in C(\mathfrak{F})$ such that

$$\|f(N)R - Rf(N)\| \le \mathrm{const}\,\|NR - RN\| \tag{3.2}$$

for all $N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ and bounded operators R. We use the notation $\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})}$ for the best constant on the right-hand side of (3.2). Theorem 3.2 implies that

$$\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le \|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})}\|N_1R - RN_2\|,$$

whenever N_1, $N_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$, R is a bounded operator, and $f \in \mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})$.

It is clear that $\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F}) \subset \mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})$ and $\|f\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})} \le \|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})}$. Note also that $\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})$ if $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$. But in general $\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F}) \ne \mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})$.

For example, $\overline{z} \in \mathrm{OL}(\mathbb{C}) \setminus \mathrm{CL}(\mathbb{C})$. Moreover, it is well known that if $f \in \mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})$, then there exists finite limit

$$\lim_{z\to z_0} \frac{f(z) - f(z_0)}{z - z_0}$$

for each limit point z_0 of $\mathfrak{F}$. This follows from results of [JW], see also [KS]. Indeed, inequality (3.4) below implies that $\mathfrak{D}_0 f \in \mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{F}}$. Hence, f has complex derivative at any nonisolated point of $\mathfrak{F}$ by Theorem 4.1 in [JW].

In particular, $\mathrm{CL}(\mathbb{C}) = \{az + b : a, b \in \mathbb{C}\}$.

Theorem 3.3. *Let f be an operator Lipschitz function on $\mathbb{C}$. Then f has finite derivative at every point in every direction.*

Proof. Clearly, $f\big|\mathbb{R}$ is an operator Lipschitz function on $\mathbb{R}$. Hence, it is differentiable everywhere on $\mathbb{R}$ by Theorem 4.1 in [JW]. In particular, the partial derivative $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x}(0)$ exists and is finite. To complete the proof, it suffices to observe that the space of operator Lipschitz functions on $\mathbb{C}$ is translation and rotation invariant. ■

It is clear from the proof of Theorem 3.3 that the following statement is also true.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $f \in \mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})$, where $\mathfrak{F}$ be a closed subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Then f has finite derivative at every point $\zeta \in \mathfrak{F}$ in each direction $\xi \in \mathbb{C}$ such that 0 is not an isolated point of $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : \zeta + t\xi \in \mathfrak{F}\}$.*

Nevertheless, it turns out that functions in $\mathrm{OL}(\mathbb{C})$ do not have to be differentiable as functions of two real variables. To construct such a function, we put

$$h_n(\zeta) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \zeta^{n+1}/\bar{\zeta}^n, & \text{if } \zeta \ne 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \zeta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3.5. *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $h_n \in \mathrm{OL}(\mathbb{C})$ and*

$$\|h_n\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathbb{C})} = \|h_n\|_{\mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{C})} = |2n + 1|.$$

The function h_n is not differentiable at the origin unless $n = 0$ or $n = -1$.

Proof. Clearly, $h_0(\zeta) = \zeta$ and $h_{-1}(\zeta) = \bar{\zeta}$. Thus the conclusion of the theorem is obvious if $n = 0$ or $n = -1$. Put

$$\operatorname{sgn}\zeta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \zeta/|\zeta|, & \text{if } \ \zeta \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \ \zeta = 0. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that $h_n(\zeta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \zeta \operatorname{sgn}^{2n}\zeta$ for $n > 0$ and $\overline{h}_n = h_{-n-1}$ for every n in $\mathbb{Z}$. Hence, it suffices to consider the case $n > 0$.

Let N_1 and N_2 be normal operators. We have

$$h_n(N_1) - h_n(N_2) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \operatorname{sgn}^{2n-2j}(N_1)(N_1 - N_2)\operatorname{sgn}^{2j}(N_2)$$

$$+ \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \operatorname{sgn}^{2n-2j}(N_1)(N_2^* - N_1^*)\operatorname{sgn}^{2j+2}(N_2),$$

since

$$N_2 \operatorname{sgn}^{2j}(N_2) = N_2^* \operatorname{sgn}^{2j+2}(N_2)$$

and

$$\operatorname{sgn}^{2n-2j-2}(N_1)N_1 = \operatorname{sgn}^{2n-2j}(N_1)N_1^*.$$

Hence, $\|h_n(N_1) - h_n(N_2)\| \le (2n+1)\|N_1 - N_2\|$.

Since, obviously, $\|h_n\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathbb{C})} \ge \|h_n\|_{\mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{C})}$, it suffices to show that $\|h_n\|_{\mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{C})} \ge 2n+1$, which follows immediately from the equality $h_n(e^{\mathrm{i}t}) = e^{\mathrm{i}(2n+1)t}$.

It is easy to see that h_n is not differentiable at the origin for $n \notin \{0, -1\}$. ■

For a function f on a subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$ we define the function

$$\big(\mathfrak{D}_0 f\big)(z, w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{f(z)-f(w)}{z-w}, & \text{if } \ z, w \in \mathfrak{F}, \ \ z \neq w, \\ 0, & \text{if } \ x \in \mathfrak{F}, \ \ z = w. \end{cases}$$

We need the following well-known inequality

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})} \le \|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{F}}} \tag{3.3}$$

for any closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. In the case $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$ the proof can be found in [AP6]. Inequality (3.3) can be derived from the following formula (see (2.8)):

$$f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2) = \iint\limits_{\mathfrak{F}\times\mathfrak{F}} (\mathfrak{D}_0 f)(z, w)\, dE_{N_1}(z)(N_1 R - R N_2)\, dE_{N_2}(z),$$

where f is a function such that $\mathfrak{D}_0 f \in \mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{F}}$, N_1 and N_2 are normal operators with bounded $N_1 R - R N_2$ whose spectra are in $\mathfrak{F}$, and E_{N_1} and E_{N_2} are the spectral measures of N_1 and N_2. One can prove that

$$\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathfrak{F}}} \le 2\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})} \tag{3.4}$$

for every closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. This was proved in [AP6] in the case $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$. The general case can be treated in the same way. We omit the details because we are not going to apply this estimate in this paper.

Let $f \in \mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})$. Suppose that $\mathfrak{F}$ has no isolated points. Put

$$\big(\mathfrak{D}f\big)(z,w) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \frac{f(z)-f(w)}{z-w}, & \text{if } \ x,y \in \mathfrak{F}, \ \ z \neq w, \\ \lim\limits_{\zeta\to w} \frac{f(\zeta)-f(w)}{\zeta-w}, & \text{if } \ z \in \mathfrak{F}, \ \ z = w. \end{cases}$$

It was observed in [AP6] that the equality

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})} = \|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})} = \|\mathfrak{D}f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathfrak{F}}$$

holds in the case $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$. In the same way one can prove that

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F})} = \|\mathfrak{D}f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathfrak{F}}$$

for every closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. We omit the details.

As we have mentioned above, the operator Lipschitz norm admits the following estimate in terms of the multiplier norm:

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})} \le \|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathfrak{F}}. \tag{3.5}$$

However, this estimate is not as helpful as in the commutator Lipschitz case. Indeed, if $\mathfrak{F}$ has nonempty interior, then for the function $\overline{z}$ the right-hand side of (3.5) is infinite, while the function $\overline{z}$ is certainly operator Lipschitz.

On the other hand, the operator Lipschitz norm admits the following upper estimate in terms of the multiplier norms of certain functions:

if f is a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$ that admits a representation

$$f(z) - f(w) = (z-w)g_1(z,w) + (\overline{z}-\overline{w})g_2(z,w), \quad z,w \in \mathfrak{F}, \tag{3.6}$$

for some $g_1, g_2 \in \mathfrak{M}_\mathfrak{F}$. Then $f \in \mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})$ and

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F})} \le \|g_1\|_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{F})} + \|g_2\|_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathfrak{F})}. \tag{3.7}$$

Indeed, as in Theorems 5.2 and 10.1 of [APPS2], it can be shown that the following formula holds for N_1, $N_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$:

$$\begin{aligned} f(N_1) - f(N_2) &= \iint\limits_{\mathfrak{F}\times\mathfrak{F}} g_1(z,w)\, dE_{N_1}(z)(N_1 - N_2)\, dE_{N_2}(w) \\ &\quad + \iint\limits_{\mathfrak{F}\times\mathfrak{F}} g_2(z,w)\, dE_{N_1}(z)(N_1^* - N_2^*)\, dE_{N_2}(w). \end{aligned}$$

This immediately implies (3.7).

Note that estimate (3.7) in many cases is considerably more helpful than (3.5). In particular, it was shown in [APPS2] that if f belongs to the Besov class $B_{\infty 1}^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, then f admits a representation of the form (3.6) with g_1, $g_2 \in \mathfrak{M}(\mathbb{C})$.

4. Absolutely convergent Fourier integrals and estimates of commutator Lipschitz norms

We are going to obtain in this section norm estimates of certain functions in the space of functions with absolute convergent Fourier integrals. This will allow us to obtain certain commutator Lipschitz estimates.

We denote by $\mathscr{Z}$ the set of complex integers:

$$\mathscr{Z} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathbb{Z} + \mathrm{i}\mathbb{Z}.$$

Put

$$\widehat{L}^1 = \widehat{L}^1(\mathbb{C}) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathscr{F}(L^1(\mathbb{C})), \quad \|f\|_{\widehat{L}^1} = \|f\|_{\widehat{L}^1(\mathbb{C})} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \big\|\mathscr{F}^{-1}f\big\|_{L^1}.$$

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that* $0 < \delta < r < \infty$. *Then there exists a function* $h \in \widehat{L}^1(\mathbb{C})$ *such that*

$$\|h\|_{\widehat{L}^1} \le \operatorname{const}\log\frac{2r}{\delta}, \quad h(0) = 0, \quad \textit{and} \quad h(z) = \frac{\overline{z}}{z}, \quad \textit{whenever} \quad \delta \le |z| \le r.$$

Proof. Clearly, it suffices to consider the case when $\delta = 2$ and $r = 2^n$ with $n \ge 1$. We can take an even function $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\varphi \subset [-2, 2]$ and $\varphi(x) = 1$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$. Put $h(z) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{\overline{z}}{z}\big(\varphi(2^{-n}|z|) - \varphi(|z|)\big)$. Then $h \in \widehat{L}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $h(z) = \frac{\overline{z}}{z}$ in the annulus $\{2 \le |z| \le 2^n\}$. To estimate $\|h\|_{\widehat{L}^1}$, we put $\psi(z) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{\overline{z}}{z}\big(\varphi(|z|/2) - \varphi(|z|)\big)$. Then

$$h(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \psi(2^{-k}z)$$

and

$$\|h\|_{\widehat{L}^1} \le \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \big\|\psi(2^{-k}z)\big\|_{\widehat{L}^1} = n\|\psi\|_{\widehat{L}^1}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Corollary 4.2. *Let* Λ *be a finite subset of* $\mathbb{C}$. *Assume that* $0 < \delta \le |\lambda - \mu| \le r$ *for all* $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$ *such that* $\lambda \ne \mu$. *Then for* $f(z) = \overline{z}$ *we have*

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\Lambda)} \le \|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda} \le \operatorname{const}\log\frac{2r}{\delta}.$$

Proof. The left inequality is a special case of (3.3) while the right one is an immediate consequence of (2.5) and Lemma 4.1. $\blacksquare$

Corollary 4.3. *Let* $f(z) = \overline{z}$ *and* $0 < \delta < r$. *Then*

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\delta\mathscr{Z} \cap r\mathbb{D})} \le \|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathscr{Z} \cap r\mathbb{D}}} \le \operatorname{const}\log\frac{2r}{\delta},$$

where $\mathbb{D} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$.

Lemma 4.4. *Put*

$$\Psi(z) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \overline{z}, & \text{if } |z| < 1, \\ z^{-1}, & \text{if } |z| \ge 1. \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

Then $\Psi \in \widehat{L}^1(\mathbb{C})$.

Proof. It is easy to see that $\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial \overline{z}} = \chi_{\mathbb{D}}$ in the sense of distributions. We need the well-known formula

$$(\mathscr{F}^{-1}\chi_{\mathbb{D}})(\zeta) = \frac{1}{2\pi|\zeta|} J_1(|\zeta|), \tag{4.2}$$

where J_1 denotes the Bessel function. We prove (4.2) here for the reader's convenience. Recall that

$$J_\nu(x) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^k (x/2)^{2k+\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu+k+1)k!}, \quad \nu \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Applying the polar change of variables and the Poisson formula (see [W], §2.3, formula (2)) we find that

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathscr{F}^{-1}\chi_{\mathbb{D}})(\zeta) &\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \chi_{\mathbb{D}}(\xi)\, e^{\mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{Re}(\xi\overline{\zeta})}\, d\boldsymbol{m}_2(\xi) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^1 r \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{\mathrm{i}r|\zeta|\cos(\psi-\theta)}\, d\psi \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^1 r J_0(r|\zeta|)\, dt = \frac{1}{2\pi|\zeta|} J_1(|\zeta|),\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{m}_2$ stands for planar Lebesgue measure. Hence,

$$(\mathscr{F}^{-1}\Psi)(\zeta) = \frac{2\mathrm{i}(\mathscr{F}^{-1}\chi_{\mathbb{D}})(\zeta)}{\zeta} = \frac{\mathrm{i}J_1(|\zeta|)}{\pi\zeta|\zeta|}.$$

It remains to observe that $|J_1(x)| \le \mathrm{const}\, x^{-1/2}$, $x > 1$, see, for example, [W], §7.21. ■

Corollary 4.5. *The function*

$$(z, w) \mapsto \Psi\left(\frac{z-w}{a}\right)$$

belongs to $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{C}}$ *and its norm in* $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{C}}$ *is equal to* $\|\Psi\|_{\widehat{L}^1(\mathbb{C})}$ *for every* $a > 0$.

Consider the following function on $\mathbb{C}$:

$$\lambda(\zeta) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \zeta^{-1}, & \zeta \ne 0, \\ 0, & \zeta = 0. \end{cases}$$

Note that for every function f on a subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$,

$$(\mathfrak{D}_0 f)(z, w) = \big(f(z) - f(w)\big)\lambda(z - w), \quad z,\, w \in \mathfrak{F}.$$

Theorem 4.6. *Let Λ be a subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $|\lambda-\mu|\ge\delta>0$ for all distinct λ and μ in Λ. Then*

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\Lambda)}\le\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda}\le\operatorname{const}\frac{1}{\delta}\sup\big\{|f(\lambda)|:\lambda\in\Lambda\big\}.$$

Proof. Note that

$$\lambda(z-w)=\frac{1}{\delta}\Psi\left(\frac{z-w}{\delta}\right),\quad (z,w)\in\Lambda\times\Lambda,$$

where Ψ is defined by (4.1). Hence, by Corollary 4.5,

$$\|\lambda(z-w)\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda}\le\operatorname{const}\frac{1}{\delta},$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda}&\le\|f(z)\lambda(z-w)\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda}+\|f(w)\lambda(z-w)\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda}\\&\le 2\operatorname{const}\frac{1}{\delta}\sup\big\{|f(\lambda)|:\lambda\in\Lambda\big\}.\quad\blacksquare\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.7. *Let $\delta>0$ and let f be a bounded function on $\delta\mathcal{Z}$. Then*

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\delta\mathcal{Z})}\le\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathcal{Z}}}\le\operatorname{const}\frac{1}{\delta}\sup\big\{|f(\delta\mathfrak{n})|:\mathfrak{n}\in\mathbb{C}\big\}.$$

The following theorem shows that Corollary 4.3 is sharp.

Theorem 4.8. *Let $f(z)=\overline{z}$ and $0<\delta<r$. Then*

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\delta\mathcal{Z}\cap r\mathbb{D})}\ge\operatorname{const}\log\frac{2r}{\delta}.$$

To prove the theorem, we need several auxiliary facts.

Lemma 4.9. *Let Ψ be the function defined by (4.1). Then*

$$|((\mathscr{F}^{-1}(\Psi^2))(\xi)|\le\frac{\operatorname{const}}{1+|\xi|^{\frac52}},\quad\xi\in\mathbb{C}.$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $\frac{\partial\Psi^2}{\partial\overline{z}}=2\overline{z}\chi_{_\mathbb{D}}(z)$ in the sense of distributions. Applying the polar change of variables, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathscr{F}^{-1}(2\overline{\xi}\chi_{_\mathbb{D}}(\xi)))(\zeta)&\overset{\mathrm{def}}{=}\frac{1}{2\pi^2}\int_{\mathbb{C}}\overline{\xi}\,\chi_{_\mathbb{D}}(\xi)\,e^{\mathrm{i}\operatorname{Re}(\xi\overline{\zeta})}\,d\boldsymbol{m}_2(\xi)\\&=\frac{1}{2\pi^2}e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}\int_0^1 r^2\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}e^{\mathrm{i}r|\zeta|\cos(\psi-\theta)}e^{-\mathrm{i}(\psi-\theta)}\,d\psi\\&=\frac{1}{\pi^2}e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}\int_0^1 r^2\int_0^{\pi}e^{\mathrm{i}r|\zeta|\cos\psi}\cos\psi\,d\psi,\end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{m}_2$ stands for planar Lebesgue measure. Applying the Poisson formula (see [W], §2.3, formula (2)), we obtain

$$\int_0^{\pi}e^{\mathrm{ix}\cos\psi}\cos\psi\,d\psi=-\mathrm{i}\frac{d}{dx}\left(\int_0^{\pi}e^{\mathrm{ix}\cos\psi}\,d\psi\right)=-\mathrm{i}\pi\mathrm{J}_0'(\mathrm{x})=\mathrm{i}\pi\mathrm{J}_1(\mathrm{x}).$$

Hence,

$$(\mathscr{F}^{-1}(2\overline{\xi}\chi_{\mathbb{D}}(\xi)))(\zeta) = \frac{\mathrm{i}e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}}{\pi}\int_0^1 r^2 J_1(r|\zeta|)\,dr = \frac{\mathrm{i}e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}}{\pi|\zeta|^3}\int_0^{|\zeta|} t^2 J_1(t)\,dt$$
$$= \frac{\mathrm{i}e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}}{\pi|\zeta|^3}\int_0^{|\zeta|}(t^2 J_2(t))'\,dt = \frac{\mathrm{i}e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}J_2(|\zeta|)}{\pi|\zeta|},$$

and so

$$(\mathscr{F}^{-1}(\Psi^2))(\zeta) = -\frac{2e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}J_2(|\zeta|)}{\pi\zeta|\zeta|} = -\frac{2J_2(|\zeta|)}{\pi\zeta^2}.$$

It remains to observe that $|J_2(x)| \le \operatorname{const} x^2$ for $x \in [0,1]$ and $|J_2(x)| \le \operatorname{const} x^{-1/2}$ for $x \in [1,\infty)$; see, for example, [W], §7.21. ■

Corollary 4.10. *The matrix* $\{\lambda^2(\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{n})\}_{\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{n}\in\mathscr{Z}}$ *induces a bounded operator on* $\ell^2(\mathscr{Z})$.

Proof. Put

$$h(\zeta) = \sum_{\mathfrak{n}\in\mathscr{Z}\setminus\{0\}} \frac{e^{\mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{Re}(\zeta\overline{\mathfrak{n}})}}{\mathfrak{n}^2}, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Clearly, the series converges in $L^2([0,2\pi]^2)$ and $h(\zeta) = h(\zeta+2\pi) = h(\zeta+2\pi\mathrm{i})$. It suffices to verify that $h \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C})$. Put

$$h_0(\zeta) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} 4\pi^2\sum_{\mathfrak{n}\in\mathbb{Z}} H(\zeta+2\pi\mathfrak{n}),$$

where $H \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathscr{F}^{-1}(\Psi^2)$. Lemma 4.9 implies that $h_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C})$. Moreover,

$$\widehat{h}_0(\mathfrak{n}) \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\int_{[0,2\pi]^2} h_0(\xi)e^{-\mathrm{i}\,\mathrm{Re}(\xi\overline{\mathfrak{n}})}\,dm_2(\xi) = (\mathscr{F}H)(\mathfrak{n}) = \Psi^2(\mathfrak{n}) = \lambda^2(\mathfrak{n}) = \widehat{h}(\mathfrak{n})$$

for all $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathscr{Z}$. Hence, $h = h_0$ almost everywhere on $\mathbb{C}$. ■

For $r > 0$, consider the matrix

$$\Lambda_r \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{|\lambda(\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{n})|^2\}_{\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{n}\in\mathscr{Z}\cap r\mathbb{D}}. \tag{4.3}$$

The following lemma gives a lower estimate for the operator norm $\|\Lambda_r\|$ of Λ_r.

Lemma 4.11. *Let* $r \ge 3$. *Then* $\|\Lambda_r\| \ge \operatorname{const}\log r$.

Proof. Let us first observe that if $A = \{a_{jk}\}_{1\le j,k\le n}$ is a matrix with nonnegative entries and $v = \{v_j\}_{1\le j\le n}$ is the vector with $v_j = 1$, $1 \le j \le n$, then

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^n a_{jk} = (Av,v) \le n\|A\|.$$

Thus it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{n}\in\mathscr{Z}\cap r\mathbb{D}} |\lambda(\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{n})|^2 \ge \operatorname{const} r^2\log r.$$

Put

$$a_{\mathfrak{p}} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \operatorname{card}\{(\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{n}) \in \mathscr{Z}^2 : \mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{p}, |\mathfrak{m}| \le r, |\mathfrak{n}| \le r\},$$

where $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{Z}$. Clearly, $a_{\mathfrak{p}} \ge \operatorname{const} r^2$ if $|\mathfrak{p}| \le \frac{1}{2}r$. We have

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{n} \in \mathscr{Z} \cap r\overline{\mathbb{D}}} |\lambda(\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{n})|^2 = \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{Z},\ \mathfrak{p} \ne 0} \frac{a_{\mathfrak{p}}}{|\mathfrak{p}|^2} \ge \operatorname{const} r^2 \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathscr{Z},\ 0<2|\mathfrak{p}|\le r} \frac{1}{|\mathfrak{p}|^2} \ge \operatorname{const} r^2 \log r. \quad \blacksquare$$

Proof of Theorem 4.8. The theorem can be reformulated as follows:

$$\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathscr{Z} \cap r\mathbb{D}}} \ge \operatorname{const} \log \frac{2r}{\delta}.$$

Clearly, it suffices to assume that $\delta = 1$ and $r \ge 3$. Consider the matrices

$$\Lambda_r^{[1]} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\mathfrak{D}_0 f(\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{n})\}_{\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{n} \in \mathscr{Z} \cap r\mathbb{D}} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_r^{[2]} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\overline{\lambda}^2(\mathfrak{m}-\mathfrak{n})\}_{\mathfrak{m},\mathfrak{n} \in \mathscr{Z} \cap r\mathbb{D}}.$$

We have

$$\Lambda_r^{[1]} \star \Lambda_r^{[2]} = \Lambda_r,$$

where the matrix Λ_r is defined by (4.3) and the Schur–Hadamard product of matrices is defined by (2.2).

It remains to observe that $\big\|\Lambda_r^{[2]}\big\| \le \operatorname{const}$ by Corollary 4.10 and $\|\Lambda_r\| \ge \operatorname{const} \log r$ by Lemma 4.11. $\blacksquare$

5. Operator and commutator moduli of continuity

In this section we define the operator modulus of continuity and various versions of commutator modulus of continuity. We study their properties and obtain estimates that will be used in the next section.

Let f be a continuous function defined on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Put

$$\Omega_f(\delta) = \Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup \big\|f(N_1) - f(N_2)\big\|, \quad \delta > 0,$$

where the supremum is taken over all $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ such that $\|N_1 - N_2\| \le \delta$. We say that Ω_f is the *operator modulus of continuity of* f.

If f is defined on a set that contains $\mathfrak{F}$, we put $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Omega_{f|\mathfrak{F},\mathfrak{F}}$.

The case $\mathfrak{F} = \mathbb{R}$ was considered in [AP2].

Note that the function f on $\mathfrak{F}$ is operator Lipschitz if and only if $\Omega_f(\delta) \le \operatorname{const} \delta$, $\delta > 0$.

Clearly, for every $f \in C(\mathfrak{F})$,

$$\omega_f(\delta) \le \Omega_f(\delta) \quad \delta > 0,$$

where ω_f is the (scalar) modulus of continuity of f:

$$\omega_f(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\{|f(\zeta_1) - f(\zeta_2)| :\ |\zeta_1 - \zeta_2| \le \delta\}, \quad \delta > 0.$$

On the other hand, it was proved in [APPS2], Theorem 8.2 that for $f \in C(\mathbb{C})$,

$$\Omega_f(\delta) \le \operatorname{const} (\omega_f)_*(\delta),$$

where for a modulus of continuity ω, the functions ω_* is defined by (1.2). In fact, the same is true for an arbitrary closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let ω be a modulus of continuity and let $\mathfrak{F}$ be a closed subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Then for every $f \in \Lambda_\omega(\mathfrak{F})$,*

$$\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}} \le C\|f\|_{\Lambda_\omega(\mathfrak{F})}\,\omega_*(\delta),$$

where C is a numerical constant.

Proof. The result reduces to the case $\mathfrak{F} = \mathbb{C}$ because each function $f \in \Lambda_\omega(\mathfrak{F})$ extends to a function $f_\natural \in \Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{C})$ so that $\|f_\natural\|_{\Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{C})} \le \text{const}\,\|f\|_{\Lambda_\omega(\mathfrak{F})}$. The appropriate extension can be constructed with the help of Whitney type theorems, see [S] for details. ■

Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. For $\delta > 0$, put

$$\Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}}(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\big\{\|f(N)A - Af(N)\| :\ N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}),\ A \in \mathbf{SA},\ \|A\| = 1,\ \|NA - AN\| \le \delta\big\}$$

and

$$\Omega_f^{\mathbf{C}}(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\big\{\|f(N)R - Rf(N)\| :\ N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}),\ \|R\| = 1,\ \|NR - RN\| \le \delta\big\}.$$

As in the case of Ω_f, we can write $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbf{SA}}$ and $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ if we want to emphasize the dependence on a closed set $\mathfrak{F}$.

Note that in [AP2] and [AP4] in the case of subsets of the real line the notation $\Omega_f^\flat$ (and $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}^\flat$) was used for $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbf{SA}}$ and $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbf{C}}$.

Recall that $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbf{SA}} = \Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ if $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$. This was proved in [AP2] in the case $\mathfrak{F} = \mathbb{R}$ and it was observed in [AP4] that the same reasoning works in the case $\mathfrak{F} \subset \mathbb{R}$.

However, the equality does not hold for arbitrary subsets of $\mathbb{C}$. For example, if $f(z) = \overline{z}$, then $\Omega_{f,\mathbb{C}}^{\mathbf{SA}}(\delta) = \delta$ and $\Omega_{f,\mathbb{C}}^{\mathbf{C}}(\delta) = \infty$. The first equality is trivial. To prove the second equality, we observe that $\Omega_{f,\mathbb{C}}^{\mathbf{C}}(\delta) = \delta\Omega_{f,\mathbb{C}}^{\mathbf{C}}(1)$ because f is a homogeneous function of degree 1. Thus, $\Omega_{f,\mathbb{C}}^{\mathbf{C}}(\delta) = \infty$ if and only if f is not commutator Lipschitz. The fact that f is not commutator Lipschitz follows from Corollary 4.3 in [JW].

Remark. It is easy to see that $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}} = \Omega_{\overline{f}}^{\mathbf{SA}}$ for every $f \in C(\mathbb{C})$. However, as we have already observed, $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{C}} \ne \Omega_{\overline{f}}^{\mathbf{C}}$ for $f(z) = z$.

Recall that an operator R on Hilbert space is called a *contraction* if $\|R\| \le 1$.

The following two theorems show that Theorem 10.2 in [AP2] can be generalized to the case of normal operators with spectrum in a fixed closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 5.2. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le \Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbf{SA}}\big(\max\{\|N_1R - RN_2\|, \|N_1^*R - RN_2^*\|\}\big)$$

for arbitrary $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ and contractions R.

Proof. We consider first the case $N_1 = N_2$. Replacing R by $R + \alpha I$ with $\|R + \alpha I\| = 1$, we see that the case $\|R\| < 1$ is reduces to the case $\|R\| = 1$. Now the desired inequality in the case $N_1 = N_2$ can be proved in the same way as the implication (iii)⇒(vi) in the proof of Theorem 3.1. The general case can be reduced to the case $N_1 = N_2$ as in the proof of the implication (vi)⇒(vii) in Theorem 3.1. ■

Remark. Theorem 5.2 shows that the definition of $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}}$ can be replaced with the following one:

$$\Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}}(\delta) = \sup\big\{\|f(N_1)A - Af(N_2)\|\big\},$$

where the supremum is taken over N_1 and N_2 in $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ and self-adjoint operators A with $\|A\| = 1$ such that $\|N_1A - AN_2\| \le \delta$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\Omega_f \le \Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}} \le 2\Omega_f.$$

Proof. The inequality $\Omega_f \le \Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}}$ follows from Theorem 5.2. To prove the inequality $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}} \le 2\Omega_f$, we repeat the arguments of the corresponding part of the proof Theorem 10.2 in [AP2]. In particular, we will use the following inequality (see [AP2], Lemma 10.4)

$$\big\|(I - T^2)^{1/2}X - X(I - T^2)^{1/2}\big\| \le \frac{\|T\| \cdot \|XT - TX\|}{(1 - \|T\|^2)^{1/2}}, \tag{5.1}$$

where X is a bounded operator and T is a self-adjoint operator with $\|T\| < 1$.

Let A be a self-adjoint operator with $\|A\| = 1$ and $\tau \in (0, 1)$. Consider the operators

$$\mathscr{N} = \begin{pmatrix} N & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & N \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathscr{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \tau A & (I - \tau^2A^2)^{1/2} \\ -(I - \tau^2A^2)^{1/2} & \tau A \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $\mathscr{U}$ is a unitary operator. We have

$$f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \tau f(N)A & f(N)(I - \tau^2A^2)^{1/2} \\ -f(N)(I - \tau^2A^2)^{1/2} & \tau f(N)A \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\mathscr{U} f(\mathscr{N}) = \begin{pmatrix} \tau Af(N) & (I - \tau^2A^2)^{1/2}f(N) \\ -(I - \tau^2A^2)^{1/2}f(N) & \tau Af(N) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Obviously,

$$\|f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{U} - \mathscr{U} f(\mathscr{N})\| \ge \tau\|f(N)A - Af(N)\|.$$

Applying (5.1) with $X = N$ and $T = \tau A$, we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{U} - \mathscr{U}\mathscr{N}\| &\le \tau\|NA - AN\| + \big\|N\big(I - \tau^2A^2\big)^{1/2} - \big(I - \tau^2A^2\big)^{1/2}N\big\| \\ &\le \big(\tau + \tau^2(1 - \tau^2)^{-1/2}\big)\|NA - AN\|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(N)A - Af(N)\| &\le \tau^{-1}\|f(\mathscr{N})\mathscr{U} - \mathscr{U} f(\mathscr{N})\| = \tau^{-1}\|f(\mathscr{U}^*\mathscr{N}\mathscr{U}) - f(\mathscr{N})\| \\ &\le \tau^{-1}\Omega_f\big(\|\mathscr{U}^*\mathscr{N}\mathscr{U} - \mathscr{N}\|\big) = \tau^{-1}\Omega_f\big(\|\mathscr{N}\mathscr{U} - \mathscr{U}\mathscr{N}\|\big) \\ &\le \tau^{-1}\Omega_f\Big(\big(\tau + \tau^2(1 - \tau^2)^{-1/2}\big)\|NA - AN\|\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Taking $\tau = 1/2$, we obtain

$$\|f(N)A - Af(N)\| \le 2\Omega_f\left(\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\right)\|NA - AN\|\right) \le 2\Omega_f\big(\|NA - AN\|\big). \quad \blacksquare$$

Remark. Note that in general for continuous functions f on $\mathbb{C}$, $\Omega_f \ne \Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}}$. Indeed, it was shown in [AP4] that there are continuous functions f on $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$\Omega_{f,\mathbb{R}} \ne \Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_{f,\mathbb{R}}$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that if f is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$ and $F(\zeta) = f(\operatorname{Re}\zeta)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{C}$, then $\Omega_{F,\mathbb{C}} = \Omega_{f,\mathbb{R}}$ and $\Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_{F,\mathbb{C}} = \Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_{f,\mathbb{R}}$.

Theorem 5.4. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| \le \Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}(\|N_1R - RN_2\|)$$

for arbitrary $N_1, N_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$ and arbitrary contractions R.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.2. ■

Remark. Theorem 5.4 shows that the definition of $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f$ can be replaced with the following one:

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta) = \sup\big\{\|f(N_1)R - Rf(N_2)\| :\ N_1,\ N_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}),\ \|R\| = 1,\ \|N_1R - RN_2\| \le \delta\big\}.$$

Theorem 5.5. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Then the functions*

$$\delta \mapsto \delta^{-1}\Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_f(\delta) \quad \textit{and} \quad \delta \mapsto \delta^{-1}\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta), \quad \delta > 0, \tag{5.2}$$

are nonincreasing. In particular,

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_f(\delta_1+\delta_2) \le \Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_f(\delta_1) + \Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_f(\delta_2) \quad \textit{and} \quad \Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta_1+\delta_2) \le \Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta_1) + \Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta_2), \quad \delta_1,\ \delta_2 > 0.$$

Proof. We consider first the case of the commutator modulus of continuity $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f$. It suffices to verify that $\tau\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta/\tau) \le \Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta)$ for $\delta \in (0,\infty)$ and $\tau \in (0,1)$. It follows from Theorem 5.4 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta/\tau) &= \tau \sup\big\{\|f(N)R - Rf(N)\| :\ \|R\| = 1,\ N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}),\ \|NR - RN\| < \delta/\tau\big\} \\
&= \sup\big\{\|f(N)R - Rf(N)\| :\ \|R\| = \tau,\ N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}),\ \|NR - RN\| < \delta\big\} \\
&\le \Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta).
\end{aligned}$$

The case of $\Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_f$ can be treated in the same way if we apply Theorem 5.2 instead of Theorem 5.4. ■

Corollary 5.6. *The functions $\Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_f$ and $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f$ are continuous as functions from $(0,\infty)$ to $[0,\infty]$.*

Proof. It suffices to observe that if the function $h : (0,\infty) \to [0,\infty]$ is nondecreasing and the function $\delta \mapsto \delta^{-1}h(\delta)$ is nonincreasing, then h is continuous. ■

We can consider 3 more versions of commutator moduli of continuity. Let f be a continuous function on a subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Put

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{U}}_f(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\big\{\|f(N)U - Uf(N)\| :\ U \in \mathbf{U},\ N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}),\ \|NU - UN\| \le \delta\big\};$$

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{USA}}_f(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\big\{\|f(N)Q - Qf(N)\| :\ Q \in \mathbf{USA},\ N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}),\ \|NQ - QN\| \le \delta\big\};$$

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{P}}_f(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup\big\{\|f(N)P - Pf(N)\| :\ P \in \mathbf{P},\ N \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F}),\ \|NP - PN\| \le \delta\big\}.$$

Theorem 5.7. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\Omega_f^{\mathbf{U}}(\delta)=\Omega_f^{\mathbf{USA}}(\delta)=\Omega_f(\delta) \quad \textit{and} \quad \Omega_f^{\mathbf{P}}(\delta)=\frac{1}{2}\Omega_f(2\delta).$$

Proof. Clearly, $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{USA}} \le \Omega_f^{\mathbf{U}} \le \Omega_f$. The inequality $\Omega_f \le \Omega_f^{\mathbf{USA}}$ can be proved in the same way as in the proof of the implication (iv)⇒(i) in Theorem 3.1. The equality $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{P}}(\delta)=\frac{1}{2}\Omega_f^{\mathbf{USA}}(2\delta)$ follows from the fact that $Q\in\mathbf{USA}$ if and only if $Q=2P-I$ for an orthogonal projection P. ■

Now we are going to show that the commutator moduli of continuity of $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}}$ and $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{C}}$ can be estimated in terms of operator Lipschitz norms and commutator Lipschitz norms.

Recall that a subset Λ of $\mathbb{C}$ is called a *δ-net* for $\mathfrak{F}$ if for every $z\in\mathfrak{F}$ there exists a $\lambda\in\Lambda$ such that $|\lambda-z|\le\delta$.

Theorem 5.8. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $\mathfrak{F}_\delta$ is a subset of $\mathfrak{F}$ that forms a $(\delta/2)$-net of $\mathfrak{F}$. Then*

$$\Omega_f^{\mathbf{SA}}(\delta)\le 2\omega_f(\delta/2)+2\delta\|f\|_{\mathrm{OL}(\mathfrak{F}_\delta)}$$

and

$$\Omega_f^{\mathbf{C}}(\delta)\le 2\omega_f(\delta/2)+2\delta\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F}_\delta)}.$$

The case $\mathfrak{F}\subset\mathbb{R}$ is Theorem 5.10 in [AP6]. The general case can be proved in the same way.

We need a lower estimate for the commutator modulus of continuity. The following theorem can be considered as a version of Theorem 5.11 in [AP2] for functions defined on subsets of $\mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 5.9. *Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$ and let $\delta>0$. Suppose that Λ and M are closed subsets of $\mathfrak{F}$ such that $(\Lambda-\mathrm{M})\cap \boldsymbol{c}\delta\,\mathbb{D}\subset\{0\}$, where $\boldsymbol{c}=\dfrac{1}{2}\|\Psi\|_{\widehat{L}^1(\mathbb{C})}$ and Ψ is defined by (4.1). Then*

$$\Omega_f^{\mathbf{C}}(\delta)\ge\max\left\{\omega_f(\delta),\frac{\delta}{2}\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}\right\}.$$

Proof. Clearly, $\omega_f\le\Omega_f\le\Omega_f^{\mathbf{C}}$. Note that

$$\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}=\sup_{a>0}\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda\cap\operatorname{clos}(a\mathbb{D}),\mathrm{M}\cap\operatorname{clos}(a\mathbb{D})}}.$$

Thus it suffices to prove that

$$\Omega_f^{\mathbf{C}}(\delta)\ge\frac{\delta}{2}\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}$$

in the case when Λ and M are bounded.

Let $\varepsilon>0$. There exist Borel measures λ on Λ and μ on M, and a function k in $L^2(\Lambda\times\mathrm{M},\lambda\otimes\mu)$ such that

$$\|k\|_{\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}^{\lambda,\mu}}=1,\quad k\,\mathfrak{D}_0\in L^2(\Lambda\times\mathrm{M},\lambda\otimes\mu),\quad\text{and}\quad \|k\,\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathcal{B}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}^{\lambda,\mu}}\ge\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}-\varepsilon.$$

We define the function k_0 in $L^2(\Lambda\times\mathrm{M},\lambda\otimes\mu)$ by

$$k_0(z,w)\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\begin{cases}k(z,w), & \text{if } z\ne w,\\ 0, & \text{if } z=w.\end{cases}$$

Then $k\mathfrak{D}_0f=k_0\mathfrak{D}_0f$ and by Corollary 2.3, $\|k_0\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}\le 2$. We define the normal operators $N_1:L^2(\Lambda,\lambda)\to L^2(\Lambda,\lambda)$ and $N_2:L^2(\mathrm{M},\mu)\to L^2(\mathrm{M},\mu)$ by $(N_1f)(z)\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}zf(z)$ and $(N_2g)(w)\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}wg(w)$. Put

$$h(z,w)\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\frac{1}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta}\Psi\Big(\frac{z-w}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta}\Big)k(z,w)=\frac{1}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta}\Psi\Big(\frac{z-w}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta}\Big)k_0(z,w),$$

where Ψ is defined by (4.1). Clearly,

$$\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}\le\frac{1}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta}\left\|\Psi\Big(\frac{z-w}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta}\Big)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}\|k\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}\le\frac{1}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta}\left\|\Psi\Big(\frac{z-w}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta}\Big)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{C}}}=\frac{2}{\delta}$$

by Corollary 4.5.

Clearly, $N_1\mathcal{I}_h-\mathcal{I}_hN_2=\mathcal{I}_{k_0}$ and $f(N_1)\mathcal{I}_h-\mathcal{I}_hf(N_2)=\mathcal{I}_{k_0\mathfrak{D}_0f}$. (Recall that $\mathcal{I}_\varphi$ is the integral operator from $L^2(\mathrm{M},\mu)$ into $L^2(\Lambda,\lambda)$ with kernel $\varphi\in L^2(\Lambda\times\mathrm{M},\lambda\otimes\nu)$.) Then

$$\left\|\frac{\delta}{2}\mathcal{I}_h\right\|=\frac{\delta}{2}\|h\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}\le 1,$$

$$\left\|N_1\left(\frac{\delta}{2}\mathcal{I}_h\right)-\left(\frac{\delta}{2}\mathcal{I}_h\right)N_2\right\|=\frac{\delta}{2}\|k_0\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}\le\delta,$$

and

$$\left\|f(N_1)\left(\frac{\delta}{2}\mathcal{I}_h\right)-\left(\frac{\delta}{2}\mathcal{I}_h\right)f(N_2)\right\|=\frac{\delta}{2}\|k_0\mathfrak{D}_0f\|_{\mathcal{B}^{\lambda,\mu}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}\ge\frac{\delta}{2}\big(\|\mathfrak{D}_0f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}-\varepsilon\big).$$

Hence, $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta)\ge\frac{\delta}{2}\big(\|\mathfrak{D}_0f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\Lambda,\mathrm{M}}}-\varepsilon\big)$ for every $\varepsilon>0$. ■

Theorem 5.9 allows us to obtain the following generalization of Theorem 4.17 in [AP4].

Theorem 5.10. *Let f be a continuous function on an unbounded closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. Suppose that $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(\delta)<\infty$ for $\delta>0$. Then the function $z\mapsto z^{-1}f(z)$ has finite limit as $|z|\to\infty$, $z\in\mathfrak{F}$.*

Proof. We repeat the arguments of the proof of Theorem 5.12 in [AP6]. Assume the contrary. Then there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathfrak{F}$ such that $|\lambda_{n+1}|-|\lambda_n|>\boldsymbol{c}$ for all $n\ge1$, where $\boldsymbol{c}$ is the same as in Theorem 5.9, $\lim_{n\to\infty}|\lambda_n|=\infty$, and the sequence $\{\lambda_n^{-1}f(\lambda_n)\}_{n=1}^\infty$ has no finite limit. Put

$$\Lambda\stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=}\{\lambda_n:\ n\ge1\}.$$

Then $\mathfrak{D}_0f\notin\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda$. This fact is contained implicitly in [JW]. Indeed, Theorem 4.1 in [JW] implies that if $\mathfrak{D}_0f\in\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda$, then f has complex derivative at every nonisolated point of $\mathfrak{F}$. It can be shown that the same argument gives us the differentiability at ∞ in the following sense: the function $z\mapsto z^{-1}f(z)$ has finite limit as $|z|\to\infty$, provided the domain of f is unbounded. Applying Theorem 5.9 for $M=\Lambda$ and $\delta=1$, we find that $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_f(1)=\infty$. ■

Remark. Theorem 5.10 can also be proved in the same way as Theorem 4.17 in [AP4].

Let M and N be (not necessarily bounded) normal operators in a Hilbert space and let R be a bounded operator on the same Hilbert space. We say that the *operator* $MR-RN$ *is bounded* if $R(\mathscr{D}_N)\subset\mathscr{D}_M$ and $\|MRu-RNu\|\le C\|u\|$ for every $u\in\mathscr{D}_N$. Then there exists a unique bounded operator K such that $Ku=MRu-RNu$ for all $u\in\mathscr{D}_N$. In this case we write $K=MR-RN$. Thus $MR-RN$ is bounded if and only if

$$\big|(Ru,M^*v)-(Nu,R^*v)\big|\le C\|u\|\cdot\|v\| \tag{5.3}$$

for every $u\in\mathscr{D}_N$ and $v\in\mathscr{D}_{M^*}=\mathscr{D}_M$. It is easy to see that $MR-RN$ is bounded if and only if $N^*R^*-R^*M^*$ is bounded, and $(MR-RN)^*=-(N^*R^*-R^*M^*)$. In particular, we write $MR=RN$ if $R(\mathscr{D}_N)\subset\mathscr{D}_M$ and $MRu=RNu$ for every $u\in\mathscr{D}_N$. We say that $\|MR-RN\|=\infty$ if $MR-RN$ is not a bounded operator.

Let us state now an analog of Lemma 4.4 in [AP4] for normal operators. Recall that for a bounded operator R, the singular values $s_j(R)$ are defined by

$$s_j(R)=\inf\big\{\|R-K\|:\ \operatorname{rank}K\le j\big\},\quad j\ge0.$$

Lemma 5.11. *Let M and N be (not necessarily bounded) normal operators and let R be an operator such that $\|R\|=1$. Then there exist a sequence of operators $\{R_n\}_{n\ge1}$ and sequences of bounded normal operators $\{M_n\}_{n\ge1}$ and $\{N_n\}_{n\ge1}$ such that*

(i) $\sigma(M_n)\subset\sigma(M)\cup\{0\}$ *and* $\sigma(N_n)\subset\sigma(N)\cup\{0\}$*;*

(ii) *the sequence $\{\|R_n\|\}_{n\ge1}$ is nondecreasing and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\|R_n\|=1;$$

(iii)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}R_n=R$$

in the strong operator topology;

(iv) *for every continuous functions f on $\mathbb{C}$, the sequence $\big\{\big\|f(M_n)R_n-R_nf(N_n)\big\|\big\}_{n\ge1}$ is nondecreasing and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\big\|f(M_n)R_n-R_nf(N_n)\big\|=\|f(M)R-Rf(N)\|;$$

(v) *if f is a continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$ such that $\|f(M)R-Rf(N)\|<\infty$, then*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}f(M_n)R_n-R_nf(N_n)=f(M)R-Rf(N)$$

in the strong operator topology;

(vi) *if f is a continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$ such that $\|f(M)R-Rf(N)\|<\infty$, then for every $j\ge0$, the sequence $\big\{s_j\big(f(M_n)R_n-R_nf(N_n)\big)\big\}_{n\ge1}$ is nondecreasing and*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}s_j\big(f(M_n)R_n-R_nf(N_n)\big)=s_j\big(f(M)R-Rf(N)\big).$$

Proof. Put $P_n\stackrel{\rm def}{=}E_M\big(n\mathbb{D}\big)$, $Q_n\stackrel{\rm def}{=}E_N\big(n\mathbb{D}\big)$ and $R_n\stackrel{\rm def}{=}P_nRQ_n$, where E_M and E_N are the spectral measures of M and N. Put $M_n\stackrel{\rm def}{=}P_nM=MP_n$ and $N_n\stackrel{\rm def}{=}Q_nN=NQ_n$. Statements (i), (ii) end (iii) are evident. Clearly,

$$P_n\big(f(M_{n+1})R_{n+1}-R_{n+1}f(N_{n+1})\big)Q_n=f(M_n)P_nRQ_n-P_nRQ_nf(N_n),\quad n\ge1.$$

Hence, the sequence $\big\{s_j\big(f(M_n)R_n - R_nf(N_n)\big)\big\}_{n\ge1}$ is nondecreasing for every $j \ge 0$. In particular, the sequence $\big\{\big\|f(M_n)R_n - R_nf(N_n)\big\|\big\}_{n\ge1}$ is nondecreasing. Statement (v) follows from the identity

$$P_n\big(f(M)R - Rf(N)\big)Q_n = f(M_n)P_nRQ_n - P_nRQ_nf(N_n), \quad n \ge 1. \tag{5.4}$$

It is easy to see from (5.4) that (v)⇒(vi).

It remains to prove (iv). If $\lim_{n\to\infty}\big\|f(M_n)R_n - R_nf(N_n)\big\| = \infty$, then the result follows from (v) with the help of an argument by contradiction.

Suppose that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\big\|f(M_n)R_n - R_nf(N_n)\big\| < \infty$. Let $u \in \mathscr{D}_{f(N)}$. Clearly, the sequence $\{R_nf(N_n)u\}_{n=1}^\infty = \{R_nf(N)u\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges. Hence, the sequence $\{f(M_n)R_nu\}_{n=1}^\infty = \{f(M)R_nu\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is bounded. Taking into account that $R_nu \to Ru$ as $n \to \infty$, we find that $Ru \in \mathscr{D}_{f(M)}$ and $f(M_n)R_nu = f(M)R_nu \to f(M)Ru$ in the weak topology. Thus, we have proved that $R(\mathscr{D}_{f(N)}) \subset \mathscr{D}_{f(M)}$ and

$$\|f(M)Ru - Rf(N)u\| \le \|u\| \lim_{n\to\infty}\big\|f(M_n)R_n - R_nf(N_n)\big\|$$

for all $u \in \mathscr{D}_{f(N)}$. Hence,

$$\|f(M)Ru - Rf(N)u\| \le \lim_{n\to\infty}\big\|f(M_n)R_n - R_nf(N_n)\big\|.$$

The opposite inequality follows from (5.4). ■

Corollary 5.12. *Theorem* 3.1 *remains valid for not necessarily bounded normal operators. Moreover, each of the statements* (i)–(vii) *in Theorem* 3.1 *is equivalent to the corresponding statement for not necessarily bounded normal operators with spectrum in* $\mathfrak{F}$.

Proof. We can assume that $0 \in \mathfrak{F}$. Note that statement (vii) for not necessarily bounded normal operators with spectrum in $\mathfrak{F}$ implies the remaining statements. Thus it suffices to verify that statement (vii) for bounded normal operators with spectrum in $\mathfrak{F}$ implies the same statement for arbitrary normal operators with spectrum in $\mathfrak{F}$. This immediately follows from Lemma 5.11. ■

Lemma 5.11 also implies that Theorems 3.2, 5.2 and 5.4 remain valid for not necessarily bounded normal operators..

Theorems 5.2 and 5.4 for not necessarily bounded normal operators imply that we obtain the same commutator moduli of continuity $\Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$ if we allow in the definitions of $\Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$ unbounded normal operators N_1 and N_2 .

We are not able to prove similar results for $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$, $\Omega^{\mathbf{U}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$, $\Omega^{\mathbf{USA}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\Omega^{\mathbf{P}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$.

Theorem 5.13. *Let* $\mathfrak{F}$ *be an unbounded closed subset of* $\mathbb{C}$ *and let* $f \in C(\mathfrak{F})$. *Then*

$$\|f(N_1) - f(N_2)\| \le 2\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}(\|N_1 - N_2\|)$$

for arbitrary (not necessary bounded) normal operators N_1 *and* N_2 *with spectra in* $\mathfrak{F}$.

Proof. We have

$$\|f(N_1) - f(N_2)\| \le \Omega^{\mathbf{SA}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}(\|N_1 - N_2\|) \le 2\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}(\|N_1 - N_2\|). \quad ■$$

Remark. A similar result with the same constant 2 can be proved for $\Omega^{\mathbf{U}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$, $\Omega^{\mathbf{USA}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\Omega^{\mathbf{P}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$. Indeed, it suffices to observe that Theorem 5.7 can be proved in the same way for "unbounded" versions of $\Omega_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$, $\Omega^{\mathbf{U}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$, $\Omega^{\mathbf{USA}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$ and $\Omega^{\mathbf{P}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}}$.

Definition 1. For a continuous function f on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$, we consider the map

$$N \mapsto f(N) \tag{5.5}$$

defined on the set of all (not necessarily bounded) normal operators with spectrum in $\mathfrak{F}$. Let N_0 be a (not necessarily bounded) normal operator with spectrum in $\mathfrak{F}$. We say that the mapping (5.5) is continuous at N_0 if for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|f(N) - f(N_0)\| < \varepsilon$, whenever N is a normal operator with spectrum in $\mathfrak{F}$ such that $\|N - N_0\| < \delta$.

We say that f is *operator continuous* if the map (5.5) is continuous at every (not necessarily bounded) normal operator N with spectrum in $\mathfrak{F}$.

It is easy to see that if f is a continuous function on $\mathfrak{F}$, then the map (5.5) is continuous at every bounded normal operator N in $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{F})$. Indeed, this is obvious when f is a polynomial of two real variables. The result for arbitrary continuous functions follows from the Stone–Weierstrass theorem applied to the polynomials on the closure of a bounded neighborhood of $\sigma(N)$ in $\mathfrak{F}$.

Definition 2. Let f be a continuous function on a closed subset $\mathfrak{F}$ of $\mathbb{C}$. It is called *uniformly operator continuous* if for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\|f(N_1) - f(N_2)\| < \varepsilon$, whenever N_1 and N_2 are normal operators with spectra in $\mathfrak{F}$ such that $\|N_1 - N_2\| < \delta$.

Theorem 5.14. *Let f be a bounded uniformly continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$. Then f is uniformly operator continuous.*

Proof. Let $\omega = \omega_f$. Then ω is a bounded modulus of continuity, and so $\omega_*(\delta) < \infty$, $\delta > 0$. The result follows now from Theorem 8.2 of [APPS2]. ■

Corollary 5.15. *Let f be a bounded uniformly continuous function on a closed subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Then f is uniformly operator continuous.*

Proof. It suffices to extend f to a bounded and uniformly continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$. To construct such an extension, one can use the first operator of continuation that was considered in [S], Ch. VI, §2.2. ■

Theorem 5.16. *Let f be an operator continuous function on a closed subset of $\mathbb{C}$. Then*

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \Omega_f(\delta) = 0,$$

and so f is uniformly operator continuous.

The proof is similar to the proof of Theorem 8.2 in [AP2].

6. **Estimates of commutator moduli of continuity**

In this section we obtain estimates of commutator moduli if continuity. In particular, we show that for $\alpha \in (0,1)$, functions f in the Hölder class $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ must be commutator Hölder of order α, i.e., $\|f(N)R - Rf(N)\| \le \mathrm{const}\,\|Nr - RN\|^\alpha \|R\|^{1-\alpha}$ for every normal operator N and every bounded operator R.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $f(z) = \overline{z}$ and $0 < \delta \le r$. Then*

$$C_1 \delta \log \frac{2r}{\delta} \le \Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_{f,\mathrm{clos}(r\mathbb{D})}(\delta) \le C_2 \delta \log \frac{2r}{\delta},$$

where positive numbers C_1 and C_2 are absolute constants.

Proof. We first prove the upper estimate. Note that the set $(\delta/3)\mathcal{Z} \cap \mathrm{clos}(r\mathbb{D})$ is a $(\delta/2)$-net for $\mathrm{clos}(r\mathbb{D})$. By Theorem 5.8 we have

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_{f,\mathrm{clos}(r\mathbb{D})}(\delta) \le 2\omega_{f,\mathrm{clos}(r\mathbb{D})}(\delta/2) + 2\delta\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\mathfrak{F}_\delta)},$$

where $\mathfrak{F}_\delta = (\delta/3)\mathcal{Z} \cap \mathrm{clos}(r\mathbb{D})$. It remains to observe that $2\omega_{f,\mathrm{clos}(r\mathbb{D})}(\delta/2) \le \delta$ and to apply Corollary 4.3. Now we prove the lower estimate. Put $\Lambda \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{M} \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \boldsymbol{c}\delta\mathcal{Z} \cap r\,\mathrm{clos}\,\mathbb{D}$, where $\boldsymbol{c}$ denotes the same as in Theorem 5.9. By Theorems 5.9 and 4.8, we obtain

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_{f,\mathrm{clos}(r\mathbb{D})}(\delta) \ge \frac{\delta}{2}\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\Lambda} \ge \mathrm{const}\,\delta \log \frac{2r}{\boldsymbol{c}\delta},$$

provided $r > \boldsymbol{c}\delta$. The case where $\delta \le r < \boldsymbol{c}\delta$ is evident. ■

Corollary 6.2. *Let N_1 and N_2 be normal operators and let R be a contraction. Then*

$$\|RN_1^* - N_2^* R\| \le \mathrm{const}\left(\log \frac{2(\|N_1\| + \|N_2\|)}{\|RN_1 - N_2R\|}\right)\|RN_1 - N_2R\|.$$

Proof. Put $r \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \|N_1\| + \|N_2\|$. It remains to apply Theorem 5.4. ■

We use the following notation:

$$\Delta_X \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{(x,x) :\ x \in X\}$$

for a set X.

Lemma 6.3. *For every $a > 0$, there exists a Borel partition $\{G_a^{(j)}\}_{j=0}^9$ of $\mathbb{C}^2$ such that*

$$\Big\{(z,w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \mathrm{dist}((z,w),\Delta_{\mathbb{C}}) < a\Big\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{9} G_a^{(j)} \subset \Big\{(z,w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \mathrm{dist}((z,w),\Delta_{\mathbb{C}}) < 3a\Big\},$$

$\big\|\chi_{G_a^{(j)}}\big\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{C},\mathbb{C}}} = 1$ *for* $j = 1, 2, \dots, 9$, *and* $\big\|\chi_{G_a^{(0)}}\big\|_{\mathfrak{M}(\mathbb{C}\times\mathbb{C})} \le 10$.

Proof. We consider first the standard partition of $\mathbb{C}$ in the squares $Q_{\mathfrak{n}}$ with side of length 1:

$$\mathbb{C} = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{n}\in\mathcal{Z}} Q_{\mathfrak{n}},$$

where

$$Q_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{z \in \mathbb{C} : 0 \le \operatorname{Re} z,\, \operatorname{Im} z < 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_\mathfrak{n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathfrak{n} + Q_0.$$

Denote by $\mathscr{Q}$ the set of all squares $Q_\mathfrak{n}$ with $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathscr{Z}$. Given $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathscr{Z}$, we define the set $\mathscr{X}_\mathfrak{n}$ by $\mathscr{X}_\mathfrak{n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup\limits_{Q \in \mathscr{Q}} \big(Q \times (\mathfrak{n} + Q)\big)$. Clearly, the family $\{\mathscr{X}_\mathfrak{n}\}_{\mathfrak{n} \in \mathscr{Z}}$ forms a partition of $\mathbb{C}^2$, and $\big\|\chi_{\mathscr{X}_\mathfrak{n}}\big\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{C}} = 1$ for every $\mathfrak{n} \in \mathscr{Z}$ by (2.3). We enumerate the sets $\mathcal{X}_\mathfrak{n}$ with $|\mathfrak{n}| \le \sqrt{2}$ by a sequence $\big\{G^{(j)}\big\}_{j=1}^{9}$ and put $G^{(0)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{9} G^{(j)}$. Then $\big\|\chi_{G_a^{(j)}}\big\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{C}} = 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, 9$ and

$$\big\|\chi_{G_a^{(0)}}\big\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{C}} \le 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{9} \big\|\chi_{G_a^{(j)}}\big\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{C}} = 10.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\big\{(z,w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z-w| \le 1\big\} \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{9} G_a^{(j)} \subset \big\{(z,w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z-w| < 2\sqrt{2}\big\}$$

and $\sqrt{2}\,\operatorname{dist}\big((z,w), \Delta_\mathbb{C}\big) = |z-w|$. Putting $G_a^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} G^{(j)}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots 9$, we obtain the desired result for $a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. The general case can be reduced to this special case with the help of dilations. ■

Lemma 6.4. *Suppose that σ and δ are positive numbers and let f be a bounded continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$ such that*

$$\operatorname{supp} \mathscr{F} f \subset \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : \ |\zeta| \le \sigma\}.$$

Then

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{CL}(\delta\mathscr{Z})} \le \|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathscr{Z}}} \le \operatorname{const} \sigma \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma\delta}\right) \|f\|_{L^\infty}.$$

Proof. The case $\sigma\delta \ge 1$ reduces to Corollary 4.7. Suppose that $\sigma\delta \le 1$. Clearly, it suffices to consider the case when $\delta = 1$. It follows from Theorem 5.1 in [APPS2] that there exist functions g_1, $g_2 \in \mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{C}$ such that $f(z) - f(w) = g_1(z,w)(z-w) + g_2(z,w)(\overline{z} - \overline{w})$ and $\|g_1\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{C}} + \|g_2\|_{\mathfrak{M}_\mathbb{C}} \le \operatorname{const} \sigma \|f\|_{L^\infty}$. We do not need the continuity of g_1 and g_2. Thus we may assume that $g_1(z,z) = g_2(z,z) = 0$ for every $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Clearly,

$$(\mathfrak{D}_0 f)(z,w) = g_1(z,w) + (\overline{z} - \overline{w})\lambda(z-w) g_2(z,w).$$

Let $G_a^{(j)}$ denote the same as in Lemma 6.3 with $a = \sigma^{-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathfrak{D}_0 f)(z,w) = {} & \chi_{G_a^{(0)}}(z,w)(\mathfrak{D}_0 f)(z,w) + \sum_{j=1}^{9} \chi_{G_a^{(j)}}(z,w) g_1(z,w) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^{9} (\overline{z} - \overline{w})\lambda(z-w)\chi_{G_a^{(j)}}(z,w) g_2(z,w).\end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\chi_{G_a^{(0)}}(z,w)(\mathfrak{D}_0 f)(z,w) = f(z)\chi_{G_a^{(0)}}(z,w)\lambda(z-w) - f(w)\chi_{G_a^{(0)}}(z,w)\lambda(z-w).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\chi_{G_a^{(0)}}(z,w)(\mathfrak{D}_0f)(z,w)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{Z}}} &\le 2\|f\|_{L^\infty}\left\|\chi_{G_a^{(0)}}(z,w)\lambda(z-w)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{Z}}}\\ &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{a}\|f\|_{L^\infty}\left\|\chi_{G_a^{(0)}}(z,w)\Phi\left(\frac{z-w}{\sqrt{2}a}\right)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{Z}}} \le \operatorname{const}\sigma\|f\|_{L^\infty}\end{aligned}$$

by Corollary 4.5. Let $j \ge 1$. Applying Lemma 6.3, we obtain

$$\left\|\chi_{G_a^{(j)}}(z,w)g_1(z,w)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{Z}}} \le \|g_1(z,w)\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{C}}} \le \operatorname{const}\sigma\|f\|_{L^\infty}.$$

It remains to estimate $\left\|(\overline{z}-\overline{w})\lambda(z-w)\chi_{G_a^{(j)}}(z,w)g_2(z,w)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{Z}}}$ for $j \ge 1$. Lemma 4.1 implies the following inequality

$$\left\|(\overline{z}-\overline{w})\lambda(z-w)\chi_{G_a^{(j)}}(z,w)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{Z}}} \le \operatorname{const}\log(1+\sigma^{-1}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|(\overline{z}-\overline{w})\lambda(z-w)\chi_{G_a^{(j)}}(z,w)g_2(z,w)\right\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathcal{Z}}} &\le \operatorname{const}\log(1+\sigma^{-1})\|g_2(z,w)\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbb{C}}}\\ &\le \operatorname{const}\sigma\log(1+\sigma^{-1})\|f\|_{L^\infty}. \quad \blacksquare\end{aligned}$$

We need the following well-known result in approximation theory (see e.g., Theorem 2.1 in [APPS2]):

Theorem 6.5. *For every uniformly continuous function f on $\mathbb{C}$ and every positive d there exists a uniformly continuous function f_d such that*

$$\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}f_d \subset \{\zeta\in\mathbb{C}:\ |\zeta|\le d^{-1}\}, \quad \omega_{f_d}\le C\omega_f, \quad \text{and} \quad \|f-f_d\|_{L^\infty}\le C\omega_f(d),$$

where C is an absolute constant.

Recall that for a modulus of continuity ω,

$$\omega_*(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta\int_\delta^\infty \frac{\omega(t)}{t^2}\,dt = \int_1^\infty \frac{\omega(\delta t)}{t^2}\,dt$$

and

$$\omega_{**}(\delta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\omega_*)_*(\delta) = \delta\int_\delta^\infty \frac{\omega(t)\log(t/\delta)}{t^2}\,dt = \int_1^\infty \frac{\omega(\delta t)\log t}{t^2}\,dt.$$

Clearly, for nondecreasing ω, we have $\omega \le \omega_* \le \omega_{**}$.

Theorem 6.6. *Let f be a uniformly continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$ such that $(\omega_f)_{**}(\delta) < \infty$ for $\delta > 0$. Then $\mathfrak{D}_0 f \in \mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathcal{Z}}$ and*

$$\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathcal{Z}}} \le \frac{C(\omega_f)_{**}(\delta)}{\delta}$$

for every $\delta > 0$, where C is an absolute constant.

Proof. By Theorem 6.5, there exists a sequence of uniformly continuous functions $\{f_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ such that

$$\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}f_n \subset \left\{\zeta\in\mathbb{C}:\ |\zeta|\le 2^{-n}\delta^{-1}\right\}, \quad \omega_{f_n}\le C\omega_f, \quad \text{and} \quad \|f-f_n\|_{L^\infty}\le C\omega_f(2^n\delta),$$

where C is an absolute constant.

We may assume that $f_n(0) = f(0)$. Then we can find a subsequence $\{f_{n_j}\}_{j=0}^{\infty}$ that converges everywhere on $\mathbb{C}$. Note that if $g(z) = \lim\limits_{j\to\infty} f_{n_j}(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$, then $\omega_g \le C\omega_f$ and $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{F}g = \{0\}$. Hence, g is a constant function because $(\omega_f)_{**}(\delta) < \infty$. This implies that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathfrak{D}_0 f_n(z,w) = 0$ for all $(z,w) \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Consequently,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}_0 f\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathcal{Z}}} \le \|\mathfrak{D}_0(f - f_0)\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathcal{Z}}} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \|\mathfrak{D}_0(f_n - f_{n+1})\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathcal{Z}}}.$$

By Corollary 4.7,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}_0(f - f_0)\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathcal{Z}}} \le \operatorname{const} \frac{\omega_f(\delta)}{\delta}.$$

By Lemma 6.4,

$$\|\mathfrak{D}_0(f_n - f_{n+1})\|_{\mathfrak{M}_{\delta\mathcal{Z}}} \le \operatorname{const} 2^{-n}\delta^{-1}(n+1)\omega_f(2^n\delta).$$

It remains to observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_f(\delta) + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 2^{-n}(n+1)\omega_f(2^n\delta) &\le \operatorname{const} \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\omega_f(t\delta)\log(t+1)}{t^2}\,dt \\ &\le \operatorname{const} \omega_f(\delta) + \operatorname{const} \int_2^{\infty} \frac{\omega_f(t\delta)\log t}{t^2}\,dt \\ &\le \operatorname{const} \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\omega_f(t\delta)\log t}{t^2}\,dt = \operatorname{const}(\omega_f)_{**}(\delta). \quad \blacksquare\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 6.7. *Let $\delta > 0$ and let f be a uniformly continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$ such that $(\omega_f)_{**}(\delta) < \infty$, $\delta > 0$. Suppose that N_1 and N_2 are normal operators with spectra in $\delta\mathcal{Z}$ and R is a contraction such that the operator $RN_1 - N_2R$ is bounded. Then*

$$\|Rf(N_1) - f(N_2)R\| \le \operatorname{const} \delta^{-1}(\omega_f)_{**}(\delta)\|RN_1 - N_2R\|.$$

Proof. The result follows from Theorem 6.6. ■

Theorem 6.8. *Let f be a uniformly continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$. Then $\Omega_f^{\mathbf{C}} \le \operatorname{const} \omega_{f_{**}}$.*

Proof. It suffices to apply Theorem 6.6 and Theorem 5.8 for $\mathfrak{F} = \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathfrak{F}_\delta = (2\delta/3)\mathcal{Z}$. ■

Theorem 6.9. *Let f be a uniformly continuous function on $\mathbb{C}$ such that $(\omega_f)_{**}(\delta) < \infty$, $\delta > 0$. If N_1 and N_2 are normal operators and R is a contraction such that the operator $RN_1 - N_2R$ is bounded, then*

$$\|Rf(N_1) - f(N_2)R\| \le \operatorname{const} (\omega_f)_{**}\big(\|RN_1 - N_2R\|\big).$$

Proof. The result follows from Theorem 6.8 and Theorem 5.4. ■

Corollary 6.10. *Let ω be a modulus of continuity such that $\omega_* \le C\omega$ for a positive number C and let $f \in \Lambda_\omega(\mathbb{R}^2)$. If N_1 and N_2 are normal operators and R is a contraction such that the operator $RN_1 - N_2R$ is bounded, then*

$$\|Rf(N_1) - f(N_2)R\| \le \operatorname{const} \omega(\|RN_1 - N_2R\|).$$

Proof. It suffices to observe that $\omega_{**} \le C^2\omega$ and apply Theorem 6.9. ■

Theorem 6.11. *Let* $0 < \alpha < 1$ *and* $f \in \Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$*. Then*

$$\|Rf(N_1) - f(N_2)R\| \le \text{const}\,\frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^2}\|RN_1 - N_2R\|^\alpha \|R\|^{1-\alpha},$$

whenever N_1 *and* N_2 *are normal operators and* R *is bounded operator such that the operator* $RN_1 - N_2R$ *us bounded.*

Proof. The result can be easily deduced from Theorem 6.9. ■

Corollary 6.12. *Let* $f \in \mathrm{Lip}(\mathbb{C}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{C})$*. Then*

$$\|Rf(N_1) - f(N_2)R\| \le \text{const}\,\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}\|RN_1 - N_2R\| \cdot \log^2\left(2 + \frac{\|f\|_{L^\infty}}{\|f\|_{\mathrm{Lip}}\|RN_1 - N_2R\|}\right),$$

whenever N_1 *and* N_2 *are normal operators and* R *is bounded operator such that the operator* $RN_1 - N_2R$ *us bounded.*

Proof. Again, the result immediately follows from Theorem 6.9. ■

Remark. It is interesting to compare above results with the results of [APPS2] quoted in the introduction that estimate the quasicommutator norms $\|Rf(N_1) - f(N_2)R\|$ in terms of $\max\big\{\|RN_1 - N_2R\|, \|RN_1^* - N_2^*R\|\big\}$.

Theorem 6.8 and all results that follows from this theorem can be generalized, in the spirit of Theorem 5.1, to the case of functions defined on a closed subset of $\mathbb{C}$. We state only a version of Theorem 6.8.

Theorem 6.13. *Let* $f \in \Lambda_\omega(\mathfrak{F})$*, where* $\mathfrak{F}$ *is a closed subset of* $\mathbb{C}$ *and* ω *is a modulus of continuity. Then*

$$\Omega^{\mathbf{C}}_{f,\mathfrak{F}} \le C\|f\|_{\Lambda_\omega(\mathfrak{F})}\omega_{**},$$

where C *is an absolute constant.*

The proof repeats the proof of Theorem 5.1.

7. Constants in operator Hölder inequalities

As we have mentioned in the the introduction, it was proved in [APPS2] that the Hölder class $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, coincides with the class of operator Hölder functions of order α. Moreover, the best constant in inequality (1.1) can be estimated from above in terms of $\text{const}(1-\alpha)^{-1}$. In this section we obtain a lower estimate for the constant in inequality (1.1).

Consider the operator Hölder semi-norm on $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$:

$$\|f\|_{\mathrm{O}\Lambda_\alpha} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sup\left\{\frac{\|f(N_1) - f(N_2)\|}{\|N_1 - N_2\|^\alpha}\right\}, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1,$$

where the supremum is taken over all bounded normal operators N_1 and N_2 such that $N_1 \ne N_2$. Denote by $\mathrm{O}\Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ the space $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ equipped with the semi-norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{O}\Lambda_\alpha}$.

Let $\mathfrak{h}_\alpha$ be the norm of the identity operator from $\Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$ to $\mathrm{O}\Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}^2)$, i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{h}_\alpha \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sup\{\|f\|_{\mathrm{O}\Lambda_\alpha} :\ f \in \Lambda_\alpha(\mathbb{R}),\ \|f\|_{\Lambda_\alpha} \le 1\}.$$

Recall that it was proved in [APPS2] that $\mathfrak{h}_\alpha \le \mathrm{const}(1-\alpha)^{-1}$.

Theorem 7.1. *There exists a positive constant C such that $\mathfrak{h}_\alpha \ge C(1-\alpha)^{-1/2}$ for all $\alpha \in (0,1)$.*

Proof. We prove the desired low estimate even in the case of functions on $\mathbb{R}$ and self-adjoint operators.

By Theorem 9.9 in [AP6], there exists a function $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\|f\|_{L^\infty} \le 1$, $\|f'\|_{L^\infty} \le 1$ and $\Omega_f(\delta) \ge c\,\delta\sqrt{\log\frac{2}{\delta}}$ for every $\delta \in (0,1)$, where c is a positive constant. Clearly,

$$\frac{|f(x)-f(y)|}{|x-y|^\alpha} = \frac{|f(x)-f(y)|^\alpha}{|x-y|^\alpha}|f(x)-f(y)|^{1-\alpha} \le 2^{1-\alpha}, \quad x \ne y,$$

and so $\|f\|_{\Lambda_\alpha} \le 2^{1-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0,1)$. Hence,

$$\mathfrak{h}_\alpha \ge \frac{c}{2^{1-\alpha}}\delta^{1-\alpha}\sqrt{\log\frac{2}{\delta}}$$

for arbitrary α and δ in $(0,1)$. Substituting $\delta = 2\exp(-\frac{1}{1-\alpha})$, we obtain

$$\mathfrak{h}_\alpha \ge \frac{c}{e}(1-\alpha)^{-1/2}$$

for $\alpha \in (0,1)$. ■

References

[AP1] A.B. Aleksandrov and V.V. Peller, *Functions of perturbed operators*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér I **347** (2009), 483–488.

[AP2] A.B. Aleksandrov and V.V. Peller, *Operator Hölder–Zygmund functions*, Advances in Math. **224** (2010), 910-966.

[AP3] A.B. Aleksandrov and V.V. Peller, *Functions of operators under perturbations of class $\boldsymbol{S}_p$*, J. Funct. Anal. **258** (2010), 3675–3724.

[AP4] A.B. Aleksandrov and V.V. Peller, *Functions of perturbed unbounded self-adjoint operators. Operator Bernstein type inequalities*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **59:4** (2010), 1451 – 1490.

[AP5] A.B. Aleksandrov and V.V. Peller, *Functions of perturbed dissipative operators*, St.Petersburg Math. J. **23:2** (2011), 9–51.

[AP6] A.B. Aleksandrov and V.V. Peller, *Estimates of operator moduli of continuity*, J. Funct. Anal. (2011), doi:10.1016/j.jfa.2011.07.009

[APPS1] A.B. Aleksandrov, V.V. Peller, D. Potapov, and F. Sukochev, *Functionsof perturbed-normal operators*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér I **348** (2010), 553–558.

[APPS2] A.B. Aleksandrov, V.V. Peller, D. Potapov, and F. Sukochev, *Functions of normal operators under perturbations*, Advances in Math. **226** (2011), 5216-5251.

[Be] G. Bennett, *Schur multipliers*, Duke Math. J. **44** (1977), 603–639.

[BS1] M.S. Birman and M.Z. Solomyak, *Double Stieltjes operator integrals*, Problems of Math. Phys., Leningrad. Univ. **1** (1966), 33–67 (Russian). English transl.: Topics Math. Physics **1** (1967), 25–54, Consultants Bureau Plenum Publishing Corporation, New York.

[BS2] M.S. Birman and M.Z. Solomyak, *Double Stieltjes operator integrals. II*, Problems of Math. Phys., Leningrad. Univ. **2** (1967), 26–60 (Russian). English transl.: Topics Math. Physics **2** (1968), 19–46, Consultants Bureau Plenum Publishing Corporation, New York.

[BS3] M.S. Birman and M.Z. Solomyak, *Double Stieltjes operator integrals. III*, Problems of Math. Phys., Leningrad. Univ. **6** (1973), 27–53 (Russian).

[BS4] M.S. Birman and M.Z. Solomyak, *Double operator integrals in Hilbert space*, Int. Equat. Oper. Theory **47** (2003), 131–168.

[F] Yu.B. Farforovskaya, *The connection of the Kantorovich-Rubinshtein metric for spectral resolutions of selfadjoint operators with functions of operators*, Vestnik Leningrad. Univ. **19** (1968), 94–97. (Russian).

[JW] B.E. Johnson and J.P. Williams, *The range of a normal derivation*, Pacific J. Math. **58** (1975), 105–122.

[K] T. Kato, *Continuity of the map* $S \mapsto \mid S \mid$ *for linear operators*, Proc. Japan Acad. **49** (1973), 157–160.

[KS] E. Kissin and V. S. Shulman, *Classes of operator-smooth functions. I Operator-lipschitz functions*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **48** (2005), 151–173.

[Mc] A. McIntosh, *Counterexample to a question on commutators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **29** (1971) 337–340.

[Pee] J. Peetre, *New thoughts on Besov spaces*, Duke Univ. Press., Durham, NC, 1976.

[Pe1] V.V.Peller, *Hankel operators of class* $\mathbf{S}_p$ *and their applications (rational approximation, Gaussian processes, the problem of majorizing operators)*, Mat. Sbornik, **113** (1980), 538-581. English Transl. in Math. USSR Sbornik, **41** (1982), 443-479.

[Pe2] V.V. Peller, *Hankel operators in the theory of perturbations of unitary and self-adjoint operators*, Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen. **19:2** (1985), 37–51 (Russian). English transl.: Funct. Anal. Appl. **19** (1985) , 111–123.

[Pe3] V.V. Peller, *For which* f *does* $A - B \in \mathbf{S}_p$ *imply that* $f(A) - f(B) \in \mathbf{S}_p$*?*, Operator Theory, Birkhäuser, **24** (1987), 289-294.

[Pe4] V.V. Peller, *Hankel operators in the perturbation theory of of unbounded self-adjoint operators.* Analysis and partial differential equations, 529–544, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., **122**, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1990.

[Pe5] V.V. Peller, *Differentiability of functions of contractions*, In: Linear and complex analysis, AMS Translations, Ser. 2 **226** (2009), 109–131, AMS, Providence.

[S] E.M. Stein, *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions*, Princeton Math. Ser., No. 30, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1970,

[W] G.N. Watson, *A treatise on the theory of Bessel functions,* Cambridge Mathematical Library. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 1995.

A.B. Aleksandrov
St.Petersburg Branch
Steklov Institute of Mathematics
Fontanka 27
191023 St-Petersburg
Russia

V.V. Peller
Department of Mathematics
Michigan State University
East Lansing
Michigan 48824
USA